

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ACADEMIC PROGRAM FACULTY ATTITUDES
TOWARD TENURE AS MEASURED BY THE TENURE ATTITUDE SCALE

Diane Peacock Brown, MOT, OTR

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August, 2002

APPROVED:

Ron Newsom, Major Professor and Coordinator of Program
in Higher Education

Mark Mortensen, Minor Professor

Robin Henson, Committee Member

Michael Altekruze, Chair of the Department of Counseling,
Development, and Higher Education

M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education

Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of
Graduate Studies

Brown, Diane Peacock, Occupational therapy academic program faculty attitudes toward tenure as measured by the Tenure Attitude Scale. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 2002, 133 pp., 15 tables, references, 139 titles.

This study explored attitudes of occupational therapy faculty toward tenure and selected alternatives to tenure. A survey method was employed, and the Tenure Attitude Survey Instrument, (TASI), was created for use in the study. Additionally, a questionnaire sought information regarding respondents' rank, tenure and administrative status, institutional type, and years in academia.

Participants were accredited occupational therapy professional program faculty who identified their primary work setting as "Academic" on the 2000-2001 American Occupational Therapy Association membership survey. Factor analysis of 577 surveys examined the structure of scores on the TASI, and the instrument consisted of 4 scales, and 18 items, as follows: Scale One: Attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection, 7 items; Scale Two: Attitude toward tenure in general, 6 items; Scale Three: Attitude toward stop-the-tenure clock provisions, 2 items; and Scale Four: Attitude toward post-tenure review, 3 items. Cronbach's alpha was conducted, as follows: TASI overall alpha = .7915; Scale 1 alpha = .7884; Scale 2 alpha = .8420; Scale 3 alpha = .7020; Scale 4 alpha = .4229.

Proportional analysis showed that most respondents were full time faculty (88.1%); taught full time at public institutions (52.8%); were tenured or tenure-track (55.5%); had no administrative duties (70.5%); with a rank of instructor or lecturer (17.5%), or

assistant professor (45.7%). Time in academia ranged from 1-40 years, with a mean of 11.27 years, median of 9.25 years, and mode of 4 years.

Attitudes toward, and support for, the continuation of tenure and for selected proposed alternatives to tenure were analyzed according to the following: faculty rank, administrative status, and tenure status. Respondents held generally favorable attitudes toward tenure as measured by Scales 1 and 2 of the TASI, and the best predictors of faculty attitude toward tenure were tenure status and rank. Due to low reliability scores on Scales 3 and 4, no conclusions can be drawn regarding respondents' attitudes toward alternatives to tenure.

Copyright 2002

by

Diane Peacock Brown

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my doctoral committee for their help and expertise. I would also like to thank my family for all the sacrifices they have made so that I could complete my doctoral work, and for the unfailing support they have offered. And finally, as in all things, to God alone be the glory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations and Delimitations	
Significance of the Problem	
Research Hypotheses	
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
3. METHOD.....	59
4. RESULTS	79
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	89
APPENDIX	107
REFERENCE LIST.....	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. TASI Construct-Item Agreement	67
2. Mean and Standard Deviations of TASI Items	69
3. Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix.....	70
4. Rotated Factor Structure Matrix.....	71
5. Communalities.....	72
6. Total Variance Explained.....	73
7. Variables, Research Questions, and Survey Items	75
8. Frequency, Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation, and Variance of Independent Variables	79
9. Demographic Questionnaire Response Data.....	80
10. Intercorrelations Between Variables.....	83
11. Faculty Tenure Status Canonical Correlations	84
12. Faculty Tenure Status Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients.....	85
13. Faculty Administrative Status Canonical Correlations	86
14. Faculty Rank Canonical Correlations	87
15. Faculty Rank Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients.....	88

INTRODUCTION

What is the role of tenure within occupational therapy academic programs? Over the past decade, public debate has explored the questions surrounding this issue as it relates to academia as a whole. Legislators, business leaders, educational consultants, university faculty, administrators, and boards of trustees have expressed opinions regarding the viability of tenure. Proponents of tenure are largely comprised of tenured faculty members and administrators who came up through the ranks of academia, devoting their energies toward educating students rather than seeking the greater financial rewards which their efforts may have earned them outside the academy (Nuchims, 1995). Arguments for the retention of tenure center on the issues of academic freedom and job security. Those who oppose the continuation of tenure or who would propose some new form of tenure, focus their arguments upon fiscal concerns, citing the need for universities to retain some degree of flexibility in personnel matters, including the ability to reduce the size of the faculty workforce during economic downturns (Keith, 1997). In addition, questions have been raised concerning the necessity of protecting academic freedom in this post civil-rights era of first amendment rights and expanded access for minorities and women. Alternatives to tenure identified by previous studies include the following: changing the duration of probationary periods, introducing "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions during the probationary periods, waiving the "up or out" provision, using long-term nontenure-track appointments, tying tenure to a specified base salary,

offering faculty inducements to forego or relinquish tenure, redefining the criteria to terminate tenured faculty, and instituting post-tenure review processes (Trower, 1996).

According to the International Post-Secondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) 1997 Fall Staff Survey (U.S. Department of Education, 1999), faculty composes 36% of all staff in educational institutions. In 1999, there were 130 accredited occupational therapy academic professional-level programs within the United States. The majority of programs were located in four-year colleges and universities (73%), and academic health centers or medical schools (25%). A total of 4,805 students graduated from these programs in academic year 1998-1999 (American Medical Association, 2000). Of these graduates, 87% were women (American Medical Association, 2000).

Tenure is a fundamental component of academia, implying guarantees of job security and academic freedom. Historically, the academy has defended tenure as an essential element of American higher education, and 91% of institutions have a tenure system (Sanderson et al., 2000). Recently, concerns have been raised concerning the feasibility of maintaining tenure in its current form, giving rise to debate within journals, at professional conferences, and in other public and private forums. There is a conflict between those who view tenure as essential, and those who say its time of usefulness has passed. Fifty-nine percent of faculty as a whole surveyed in a Carnegie Foundation study (1989) held the opinion that the abolition of tenure would not improve the overall quality of higher education. More recently, 67% of all respondents to the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Gilmarlin, 1999) disagreed with the statement that "tenure is an outmoded concept". Sanderson, Phua, and

Herda (2000) report that 55% of total faculty in their survey favored the retention of tenure. Does their perspective differ from occupational therapy faculty, in relation to tenure?

Faculty within allied health programs differ from faculty in other areas of academia in many ways (Holt, 1991; Kelley & Baker, 1980; Mettler & Bork, 1985; Ottenbacher & Stull, 1992; Parham, 1985). Most lack research productivity and have not earned a doctorate (Holt, 1991; Kelley & Baker, 1980; Michels, 1989; Parham, 1985; Parham & Zemke, 1997; Robinson, 1978). Allied health faculty are hired on the basis of their ability to teach clinical competencies, rather than upon their educational credentials. As a result, they tend to emphasize teaching over research (Holt, 1991). Are the issues mentioned above relevant to clinical and tenure-track faculty within these professional programs? Do those occupational therapists whose specialty area is education favor the continuation of tenure, or is the issue irrelevant to them? This study explored these and other questions regarding attitudes of occupational therapy faculty toward tenure.

The Problem

Given the professional characteristics such as low research productivity, lack of a doctorate, and an emphasis upon teaching over research, which distinguish occupational therapy faculty from faculty as a whole, what are the attitudes of occupational therapy faculty toward tenure and proposed alternatives to tenure such as: 1) long-term nontenure-track appointments; 2) changing the duration of probationary periods; and 3) post-tenure review?

Purpose of the Study

The study explored current attitudes of occupational therapy accredited professional program faculty toward tenure. The theoretical framework is the historical background of the academy, with its traditional reliance upon tenured faculty to provide stability of influence upon the university environment. Current views were contrasted with the more traditionally-held beliefs.

A survey method of research was employed, in which subjects responded to items seeking positive and negative attitudes toward tenure issues on a Likert-type scale. Proportional analysis of respondents as to faculty rank, full or part-time status, tenure status, and length of time in academia was accomplished. Attitudes toward, and support for, the continuation of tenure and for selected proposed alternatives to tenure was analyzed and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Research Questions

Regarding faculty in accredited occupational therapy professional programs within the United States, employed within the 2001-2002 academic year:

1. What are the relative percentages of tenured or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and faculty by rank, as reported by subjects participating in this research?
2. Do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, tenure status, and administrative status?
 - a. Attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection?
 - b. Attitude toward tenure in general?

- c. Attitude toward "stop-the-tenure clock" provisions?
- d. Attitude toward post-tenure review?

Significance of the Study

As a profession, occupational therapy is undergoing a period of change (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1995). Traditional markets for occupational therapy services are shrinking, with many services that were previously provided at skilled rates of reimbursement now being rendered by less-skilled individuals. Academic programs are challenged to produce qualified students who will meet these and other challenges of the future. Therefore, these programs need to reflect the level of efficiency and meet current accountability standards of practice environments, while maintaining professional standards of classroom and clinical instruction. Faculty are the "direct care providers" of occupational therapy professional programs. They are the ones who must meet the daily challenge of providing stimulating and relevant instruction within classroom and laboratory environments, so that students have the ability to become successful members of the profession. Students must be adequately prepared in order to successfully complete level II clinical fieldwork experiences and obtain passing scores on the national registration exam after graduation. Faculty reward systems, including tenure, should reflect the mission of the institution and serve as a form of external motivation toward excellence.

While faculty are working directly with students, administrators must somehow find the money to support these programs, hire qualified faculty, and assume responsibility for the overall integrity of the program. This is a significant undertaking,

and one in which faculty morale and job satisfaction are integral to success. External reward and recognition systems, of which tenure is a part, have been shown to have a significant impact upon job satisfaction of faculty members (Lewis & Becker, 1979; Tuckman, 1976). If the administrators of today are to plan for the occupational therapy programs of tomorrow, it would be beneficial for them to understand faculty attitudes toward tenure and to know whether occupational therapy faculty perceive a need for the continuation of tenure in its traditional form. This study proposed to seek the opinions and perceptions of occupational therapy faculty about tenure, and to report the results to the academic and professional community of occupational therapists, so that they may benefit from the information obtained through this study. These data may prove useful for long-term departmental and institutional planning, and to guide personnel decisions relating to faculty.

Limitations of the Study

The data were collected through surveys administered in a cross-sectional time frame, which provided a "snapshot" of faculty attitudes at the time of the study. Threats to validity that apply to such a sample limit the application of the results of this study, including historical threats and the limitations inherent in the survey method of research. Further limitations include those associated with self-administered questionnaires, such as loss of control over the identity of respondents, and the possibility that the meaning of questions will be misinterpreted, yielding an unreliable response. A questionnaire was mailed to each member of the population; however, the list of faculty obtained from the American Occupational Therapy Association may not have contained the names of all

faculty teaching within accredited academic programs. Additionally, the response rate achieved will limit the inferences to be made. Statistical inferences extend only to individuals similar to those who responded to the questionnaire, and the characteristics of non-respondents cannot be determined.

Delimitations of the Study

The proposed study was delimited in the following ways:

- 1) Only accredited professional occupational therapy program faculty who have identified their primary work-setting as academic on the current American Occupational Therapy Association Membership Invoice Questionnaire were surveyed.
- 2) Only faculty from such programs within the United States were surveyed.
- 3) Only responses from persons who indicate that they spend some part of their time teaching students were analyzed. Responses from individuals who have exclusively administrative duties were excluded from the analysis.

Definition of Terms

1. **Academic freedom**- freedom of faculty to "inquire, discover, publish, and teach the truth . . . without any control or authority of the rational methods by which truth is established" (Hook, 1971).
2. **Academic rank**- positions of faculty employment within an institution of higher education such as lecturer, clinical instructor, instructor, assistant clinical professor, assistant professor, associate clinical professor, associate professor, clinical professor, or professor.

3. **Accredited occupational therapy program**- An educational program that is officially recognized by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education of the American Occupational Therapy Association as accredited for entry-level educational programs for the occupational therapist.
4. **Clinical Faculty**- a faculty member within an institution of higher education whose primary job responsibilities relate to teaching clinical competencies to students, and who are not eligible for tenure.
5. **Faculty** – an employee of a four-year institution of higher education who spends some portion of his or her time teaching students.
6. **Part-time faculty**- a faculty member within an institution of higher education who is employed less than full-time.
7. **Post-Tenure Review**-a process of performance evaluation that occurs after a faculty member within an institution of higher education has achieved tenure.
8. **Stop-the-clock**- provisions in tenure policies that defer the deadline for seeking tenure under certain circumstances.
9. **Tenure** – a property right of faculty within institutions of higher learning which is obtained through a specified review process.
10. **Tenure Attitude Scale Instrument (TASI)** - the researcher-developed instrument for the purpose of measuring attitudes of occupational therapy faculty toward tenure and alternatives to tenure.
11. **Tenure-track** - a position of employment in an institution of higher learning in which the employee aspires to earn tenure.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The higher education literature contains many references to tenure. This review will compare faculty characteristics and tenure practices within the academy as a whole, to faculty characteristics and tenure practices within accredited occupational therapy academic programs. The perspectives of the two groups will be silhouetted upon the background of currently proposed alternatives to tenure, in an attempt to establish a theoretical basis for the proposed study.

The review will commence with a look at the beginnings of the professoriate and tenure within the academy as a whole. The process of obtaining tenure will be briefly discussed, including the relative importance of teaching and research in tenure decisions. The small number of previous studies which examined the attitudes of faculty as a whole toward tenure will be discussed. Since occupational therapy programs are frequently closely linked to schools of allied health, faculty characteristics and tenure practices within the general field of allied health will be reported from the literature, followed by a closer look at faculty within schools of occupational therapy. The beginnings of the profession will be briefly reported. Finally, the literature on proposed alternatives to tenure will be superimposed upon the background of the academy as a whole, and schools of occupational therapy in particular.

Historical Foundations of Tenure Within the Academy

According to Metzger (1979), the professoriate began in the middle ages with patronage provided by kings and located within the Roman Catholic church. Scholars were considered to be masters, were organized into guilds, and enjoyed high social status. Doctrinal disputes were rare, and the profession was cooperative in nature, rather than competitive. There were some early attempts made to limit the tenure of masters to seven to ten years (Metzger, 1979).

American higher education is modeled upon the English system in which colleges are governed by boards. In this country, those governing boards were comprised of clergy and laymen from the community. Faculty had no direct role in governance or matters of curricula, including personnel decisions (Poch, 1993). Harvard College was founded by religious groups for the education of the clergy and other gentlemen, and the curriculum was closely monitored by these religious groups to assure that the content reflected their own conservative viewpoints.

By the time of the nineteenth century, the secular German model of education was beginning to have an influence upon American institutions of higher education.

According to Hook (1971), German universities were known for both "lernfreiheit" (freedom of students) and "lehrfreiheit", (freedom of professors). German faculty members enjoyed active participation in matters of university governance, in contrast to their American counterparts (Poch, 1993). Faculty specialization into disciplines was also a result of the German influence. The Morrill Act of 1862, which created the system of land-grant colleges and universities worked with the German Scientific model to

"democratize" education in the United States. The inclusion of scientific and practical education into the curriculum opened higher education to large numbers of people who would otherwise not have attended college. During the 19th century, faculty at American Universities were appointed for one year. At the end of that year, all positions were vacated, and reappointment was offered to those who passed their annual review (Metzger, 1979).

American Association of University Professors. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was organized in 1915 by Arthur Lovejoy and John Dewey with the stated aim of facilitating cooperation among teachers and researchers and advancing the standards of the profession (Hook, 1971). From the outset, tenure was linked with freedom of expression, and was a major issue of concern for the AAUP (Metzger, 1979). The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Tenure and Freedom, issued jointly by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges, was the result of years of negotiation with administrators.

Definition of Tenure

Tenure was originally established to offer faculty protection from the whims of the administration. Specifically, faculty were given academic freedom of speech and expression within the classroom, without fear of wrongful termination as a result of expressing unpopular or contrary opinions (Van Alstyne, 1971). Originally, the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles protected only tenured faculty members. However, after the dismissal of untenured professors for political reasons during the McCarthy era, the

AAUP called for due process to be extended to all faculty members (Brown & Kurland, 1993).

Academic tenure is defined as follows by the AAUP:

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies. (1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, AAUP Policy Statement)

The AAUP definition has been used by the courts to establish the employment rights of faculty members, apparently interpreting the definition as a kind of industry practice (Olswang & Lee, 1984).

Legally, tenure is a property interest held by an individual faculty member and protected by the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution (Baez & Centra, 1995). The employment of faculty members at public institutions is protected, except in either of two specified circumstances. One circumstance is such as where "cause" may be found for termination of employment, and the other is for reasons of financial exigency of the institution (Leed, 1997). According to the 1940 AAUP Statement on Tenure, a faculty member dismissed for cause has a right to due process in the form of consideration of the facts of the case by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution (AAUP, 1990). The courts have upheld public university faculty members' rights to due process and academic freedom, including adequate notice and a hearing (*Wieman v. Updegraff*, 344 U.S. 183(1952); *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234 (1957); *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589 (1967) in Leed, 1997).

Untenured faculty at public universities have a right to due process, for the duration of their contracts; however, nonrenewal of the employment contract is not considered to be a denial of an individual's property interest (Baez & Centra). The rights of faculty members at private institutions is governed by contract law (Baez & Centra).

Financial exigency has been defined in various ways, and relates to the ability of an institution to remain viable and financially solvent, while still fulfilling its contractual obligations to tenured faculty. If the faculty member's termination is based upon financial exigency, these difficulties must be "demonstrably bona fide" (AAUP, 1990). This condition is open to interpretation, however, according to Chabotar and Honan (1997), and criteria vary widely among institutions. Chabotar and Honan recommend that institutions provide a definition of what constitutes financial exigency within the faculty handbook. The courts have supported institutions' claims regarding financial exigency, and have supported decisions made during times of financial crisis (Johnson, 1991; Olswang, 1992). As long as the criteria are clear and are not arbitrary, institutions may eliminate tenured positions. Tenured faculty at public institutions retain their right to due process before their positions are eliminated, however (Olswang, 1982).

Historically, tenure and academic freedom have been linked to faculty members' desire for job security (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Leed, 1997; Lucas, 1994; Schmitt, 1972). Richard Van Alstyne, past president and legal counsel for the AAUP has said that tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment (Van Alstyne, 1971). Rather, it is supposed to be a safeguard against dismissal of full-time faculty "without adequate cause" (p. 328). McPherson and Winston (1983) described tenure as "a reasonable way

of solving the peculiar personnel problems that arise in employing expensively trained and narrowly specialized people to spend their lifetimes at well-defined and narrowly specialized tasks" (p. 164). In other words, faculty are not generalists, but specialists, and thus have limited career mobility. Educational institutions hire faculty members to teach highly specialized subject areas within a discipline. A faculty member who specializes in 16th century literature cannot easily be retrained to teach 20th century American fiction. Keith (1997) contrasted this to current industry practices, where businesses hire individuals who are expected to change their fields or their duties many times over the course of a career. Tenure assures that individuals who specialize in a particular area are able to retain employment throughout their working lives. Tenure also serves as a tool to recruit qualified faculty, and can contribute to the security of an institution. Stability and longevity among faculty may enhance the reputation of a university and promote quality (Benjamin, 1995; Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

For whatever purposes tenure exists, an overwhelming majority of institutions of higher education subscribe to the practice of granting tenure. In 1997-98, 60 percent of all faculty members on 9-and 10-month contracts within such institutions were tenured (Brown, 1999). Chait and Trower (1997) report that 97 percent of research universities and 99 percent of four-year public colleges offer tenure. Tenure represents a financial commitment on the part of the university, with Brown and Kurland (1993) reporting that a tenure appointment may cost an institution approximately \$2 million to employ an individual until retirement.

Academic Freedom

Among those who debate the relative merits of the tenure system, a near-universal theme is the protection of academic freedom. P. Sydney Hook (1971) describes academic freedom within American universities as follows:

It is the freedom of professionally qualified persons to inquire, discover, publish and teach the truth as they see it in their field of competence, without any control or authority of the rational methods by which truth is established. Insofar as it acknowledges intellectual discipline or restraint from a community, it is only from the community of qualified scholars which accepts the authority of rational inquiry. (p. 10)

Arguments against the use of tenure for this purpose cite the need to protect the right to academic freedom for those "other" faculty members--those who lack tenure. The AAUP 1940 Statement states that nontenured, probationary faculty "should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have" (AAUP, 1990, p. 4). There is some evidence to support the views that this is not commonly practiced among universities. O'Toole (1978) stated that, while the academic freedom of tenured faculty may be protected, untenured faculty have no such guarantees. Keith's (1997) study supported the view that nontenured faculty lack the freedom to express their views freely, and feel that they must "lay low" (p. 15). He states that faculty members' desire for tenure is so great that they willingly defer their right to academic freedom until after tenure has been awarded (Keith). Gappa and MacDermid (1997) reported that junior faculty tend to "align their personal and professional interests to the senior faculty's demands" (p. 6).

Tenure may also be used as a tool by the university to maintain the status quo. Faculty members surveyed by Keith (1997) said that the tenure system "screens out those

who are most radical--those who are the most likely to need academic freedom" (p. 14). According to O'Toole (1978), universities are cautious about awarding tenure to outspoken faculty who have the potential to embarrass the university. This caution on the part of the institution may extend to the faculty member's research interests, leading Slaughter (1987) to speculate that during the 1970's, "many probationary faculty silently engaged in controversial research may have been quietly removed during tenure decisions" (p. 95). There is some evidence that universities use tenure as a quality control device, insuring that only those individuals who have the most promise will be offered lasting employment.

Legal implications and safeguards of tenure. Some authors have pointed out that legal safeguards currently exist to assure equity and academic freedom for faculty, aside from tenure. Faculty in public institutions are covered by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These laws protect citizens against discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, veteran status, or disability. Baez and Centra (1995) report that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act specifically covers race discrimination in promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) exists to deal with discriminatory practices in the workplace.

Promotion and Tenure Standards

The criteria for attaining tenure are complex and vary among granting institutions, however, some common aspects of tenure are seen to exist at various institutions (Chait & Ford, 1982; Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973). Following

the AAUP 1940 recommendations, tenure candidates are reviewed following a period of probationary service. The review process lasts for most of the academic year, and "consists of input from peer-review committees, department heads, deans, and other administrators" (Leap, 1993). The faculty member submits evidence of his or her accomplishments, including letters of evaluation from scholars at other institutions (Leap). If the faculty member is not granted tenure, typically he or she is given a one-year terminal contract, a process known as "up or out" (Baez & Centra, 1995).

Importance of Teaching and Research

Although many institutions profess that teaching, research, and service have equal weight in tenure decisions, some evidence exists to refute this claim (Diamond, 1993; Edgerton, 1993). Akins (1997) reports a study which showed that in practice, greater weight is given to research and external funding. Tang and Chamberlain (1993) reported a study of perceptual differences regarding teaching and research between faculty and administrators in Tennessee universities. While this study does not report directly upon attitudes toward tenure, teaching and research are important components of faculty evaluation and rewards leading to tenure. The authors developed a 22-item questionnaire in which subjects were asked to indicate level of agreement with statements regarding research and teaching (Tang & Chamberlain).

Results of the study showed that administrators' attitudes toward teaching and research differed significantly from those held by faculty members. Specifically, administrators indicated that the two were equally important, and were rewarded equally. Faculty perceived that research was valued more highly than teaching ability, and favored

a system which allowed them to emphasize one or the other of the two, but not both.

Validity of the questionnaire was not addressed by the authors' report. The questionnaire used in the above-mentioned study was modeled after one previously used by Schiller (1985). A section of the Schiller questionnaire focused on the research environment and the factors participants believed promoted research activity within their institution.

Heydinger and Simsek (1992) trace the emphasis upon research to the monetary rewards and prestige gained by an academic institution which receives large research grants. Boyer (1990) noted that emphasizing research moves the focus of educational activities from the student to the professor, from generalized to specialized education, and from commitment to the campus to loyalty to the profession. This shift in emphasis is reflected in tenure decisions, with research and publications outweighing teaching in the criteria for attainment for tenure. Boyer (1990) further notes that the influence of this model extends to shape faculty roles and performance throughout higher education, not just at research universities.

As universities increase their participation in non-traditional methods of instructional delivery, such as distance learning and web-based courses, changes are needed in faculty reward systems to reflect a more inclusive definition of scholarly activities. In a study conducted by Wolcott (1999), faculty members stated that they did not feel that their institutions' current promotion and tenure system rewarded participation in distance learning activities. In fact, they cited intrinsic satisfaction as the motivation for their participation in distance learning, despite the huge investment of time such efforts require on the part of faculty. Results further showed that participants did not

believe they had received formal recognition from their department, college, or institution for teaching distance learning courses, despite the fact that many strongly agreed that distance education was congruent with their institution's mission (Wolcott).

Faculty Socialization

There has been some discussion in the literature about certain unwritten criteria which may affect decision-making behavior related to tenure decisions. Faculty socialization is one such factor which seems to have an indirect effect upon the attainment of tenure, and is related to the formation of supportive peer networks and resultant mentoring relationships. Katz (1973) believes that tenure decisions are influenced by the social context of the institution and that consideration of physical attributes and social connections of faculty seeking tenure play a role in the outcome of tenure decisions. Other authors have raised the question of the impact of an individual faculty member's ethnicity and gender upon attainment of tenure (Epps, 1989; Rogers, 1995). In 1997-98, 71 percent of tenured faculty were males, and they earned about \$10,300 more annually than female faculty (Brown, 1999).

If academia is a culture, new faculty members must learn about the collective values and beliefs of the organization (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The process of socialization implies interaction between the new member and the established culture through both formal and informal means. These interactions are open to interpretation, thus allowing for ambiguity and misunderstanding (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). New faculty members must decode these messages in order to be successful (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The experience of socialization may vary according to the gender of the participant (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988). Davis and Astin (1990) reported upon a study in which highly productive faculty members were asked to identify factors which contributed to their success. Female faculty members mentioned facilitating factors such as hard work, or high levels of motivation, while males mentioned such external factors as funding from the institution. When asked to identify factors which placed constraints upon their achievement, females listed limited time, family obligation, and high teaching loads, while male faculty members identified limited funding or lack of institutional backing (Davis & Astin).

Rogers (1995) related peer networks and mentoring relationships to the promotion and tenure process and included the effects of gender. While others have explored gender bias in the tenure process (Connors, 1990), Rogers posited that female Mexican-American faculty are not accepted by white non-Hispanic female faculty members and thus, may be socially isolated from peer networks and mentoring relationships. She presumed that non-minority women have access to supportive networks and mentoring by senior faculty which are denied to Mexican-Americans, and concluded that the barriers faced by Mexican-American female faculty "seemed unsurmountable" (Rogers, 1995, p. 129). Contrary to Rogers' findings, however, Menges & Exum (1983) indicated that female faculty generally share the same kind of experiences, regardless of ethnicity. Other authors have cited instances of gender bias independent of the effects of ethnicity (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Chamberlain, 1988; Connors, 1990; Cooper, 1983; Hensel, 1991; Howard, 1978; Maitland, 1990).

Institutionalized racism has been cited as a limiting factor upon attainment of tenure by minority faculty. "[Minorities] are often in non-tenured positions or special programs for minorities. More than likely many will start their careers as part-time, adjunct, or associate professors and retire at the same level" (Epps 1989, p. 25). Luz Reyes, and Halcon (1988) reported that minority faculty's assignments tend to be directed toward teaching and service, to the exclusion of research. They saw this as a limiting factor in the formation of mentoring relationships leading to attainment of tenure (Luz Reyes, & Halcon).

Job Satisfaction Among Faculty

Studies have examined issues of gender and ethnicity as related to faculty job satisfaction and tenure. A study by the Higher Education Research Institute in 1995-96 (Magner, 1996) found that faculty gained the greatest satisfaction from autonomy and independence. Rogers (1995) study compared job satisfaction of white non-Hispanic women to that of Mexican-American women in higher education as related to variables of supervision, salary, promotion, recognition, job security, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, and colleague relationships. Results showed that Mexican-American female faculty were not as satisfied in the areas of supervision, working conditions, recognition, and colleague relationships. The recognition component was the most significantly different one for the Mexican-Americans in the above-mentioned study reported by Rogers. She reported that Mexican-American women faculty were dissatisfied with the recognition component when they felt that their teaching responsibilities had to be put aside during the tenure process. Both groups believed that

the more time they spent on teaching, the less recognition they received. Time spent on teaching was viewed as time taken away from conducting research. She also mentioned that the Mexican-American women in her study began their careers later in life than their non-minority counterparts, thus delaying the promotion and tenure process. Rogers drew several conclusions regarding factors related to job satisfaction among both groups of female faculty members. Common to both groups was a belief that the tenure process is biased against them. She felt that female minority faculty were doubly rejected by their peers--once for being women and once for being non-white.

Previous Studies of Faculty Attitude Toward Tenure

Examination of the higher education literature reveals that few studies have been reported upon which examined faculty attitudes toward tenure. The Carnegie Foundation (1989) conducted a survey in which faculty members were asked for their opinion on whether the abolition of tenure would improve the overall quality of American higher education. Twenty nine percent of responding faculty agreed that it would, while 59% disagreed (Carnegie Foundation).

Johnson (1991) surveyed the attitudes of faculty members at Florida's community colleges regarding tenure and related them to variables of age, gender, rank, years of employment and tenure status. Results were that the only significant factors in determining faculty attitudes toward tenure were rank and tenure status of the respondent. Johnson theorized that the 76% return rate achieved in the study reflected a high level of interest on the part of faculty regarding tenure. Limitations of the study include the fact that it was restricted to community colleges within the Florida system.

Johnson's (1991) study used an original survey instrument which, when pilot tested, yielded a coefficient alpha of .72. The Likert scaled survey consisted of twenty-five items, each reflecting a positive or negative attitude toward tenure. Subjects were asked to respond according to their level of agreement to each statement. Upon face examination, the instrument appears to cover the issues related to tenure currently being debated with academia.

McCart (1991) interviewed 57 faculty members at a public university regarding their views on tenure as being positive or negative. Sixty percent viewed tenure as a positive aspect of academia, while five percent said it was not a positive aspect. Thirty percent said there were both pros and cons, and five percent said it was more important in the liberal arts fields.

Premeaux and Mondy (1996) report a survey of business administration school faculty and administrators in which most faculty believed tenure was necessary for academic freedom. Half of the administrators in the study agreed. Most of both groups agreed that tenure should be modified, evaluated periodically, and time-limited.

Keith (1997) conducted a study of 75 faculty members at five private universities in southern California representing the fields of sociology, history, biology, and business. In his study, faculty were asked to rate seven questions on tenure according to their relative importance, and then to comment upon their ratings. A structured interview technique was employed for data collection, yielding both quantitative and qualitative data. Results showed that faculty rated job security and due process as more important attributes of tenure than the protection of academic freedom or professional status.

Additionally, they felt that academic freedom would still be moderately well protected on their campuses without tenure.

The Higher Education Research Institute conducted a national survey of higher education faculty during academic year 1998-1999 (Sax et al., 1999). Data were collected regarding demographic characteristics, faculty stress, tenure attitudes, faculty diversity, academic climate, community service and social activism, and gains in gender equity. Two out of fifty-nine items on the survey dealt with faculty attitudes toward tenure. Sixty-eight percent of all faculty responding to the survey disagreed with a statement that "tenure is an outmoded concept" (Sax et al., p. 8). Seventy-six percent agreed that "tenure is essential to attract the best minds to academe" (Sax et al., p. 8). This represents an increase of 5% and 7%, respectively, since the survey was previously conducted five years previously, during 1993-1994. This survey would support the belief that faculty as a whole favor the continuation of traditional tenure.

The American Faculty Poll project surveyed faculty regarding various aspects of academic life, including tenure, during 1999 (Sanderson et al, 2000). The survey asked faculty whether there had been any efforts at their institution within the past two years to "eliminate, weaken, or modify" (Sanderson et al., p. 35) tenure. Thirty-two percent said there had been efforts made to change or eliminate the tenure system at their institutions, and 59% said there had been no such efforts at their institutions. The other 9% did not know where there have been any efforts of this kind. Of the faculty members where there have been efforts to change the tenure system, 97% favor the retention of tenure, either "as-is" or with some modifications. Fifty-five percent favor the retention of tenure in its

current format. Tenured and tenure-track faculty favored maintaining present systems of tenure in larger percentages than did non-tenure-track faculty. It should be noted that not all faculty were surveyed regarding their support of tenure. Only those who answered affirmatively to whether there had been recent efforts to change the tenure system were allowed to express their support for or opposition to tenure (Sanderson et al.). In the same study, faculty reported that efforts to change tenure had focused upon increased hiring of part-time faculty and the institution of post-tenure review policies. This study indicates that faculty support tenure, especially when they feel that its existence is threatened at their institution.

Faculty Within Schools of Allied Health

Several studies have indicated that faculty employed to teach in allied health programs differ from faculty in other areas of academia in many ways (Holt, 1991; Kelley & Baker, 1980; Mettler & Bork, 1985; Ottenbacher & Stull, 1992; Parham, 1985). Most are not doctorally-prepared and lack research productivity (Holt; Kelley & Baker; Michels, 1989; Parham; Parham & Zemke, 1997; Robinson, 1978). In addition, most allied health faculty are hired on the basis of their ability to teach clinical competencies, rather than upon their educational credentials. As a result, they tend to emphasize teaching over research (Holt).

Mettler and Bork (1985) describe the establishment of "nontraditional tenure criteria" by schools of allied health in an effort to retain qualified faculty. These criteria "redefined degree requirements and expectations of scholarly productivity" and resulted in a group of tenured faculty who were viewed as "second-class citizens on campus",

according to the authors. In some cases, the masters degree was defined as the terminal degree and emphasis was placed upon teaching, rather than upon scholarship (Mettler & Bork).

Faculty characteristics within schools of allied health. Holcomb and Rousch (1988) surveyed health professions faculty in southern academic health science centers, and found that few of the faculty had presented scholarly work at conferences and even less had published in refereed journals. The participants cited a lack of preparation for engaging in research, emphasis upon preparing students to become clinicians instead of researchers, and a lack of time allotted to engage in research as reasons for their lack of scholarly productivity (Holcomb & Rousch). Kraemer and Lyons' (1989) survey agreed that faculty in academic programs do not emphasize research as much as their colleagues in academia as a whole.

Hiller and Ritvo's later (1991) study asserts that allied health school promotion and tenure committees are often made up of tenured faculty who do not possess doctorates. These committees frequently emphasize practice skills over research when considering applicants for tenure. The distinction is made by Hiller and Ritvo between promotion decisions, which they believe represent an award for past accomplishments, and tenure, which represents a belief in the applicant's future potential. National associations of allied health professions have encouraged practitioners to engage in research and to report upon their findings in journals and at professional conferences (Christiansen, 1981, 1991; Flanigan, Ballinger, Grant, Schiller, & Walker, 1988; Gillette, 1982; Llorens & Gillette, 1985; West, 1949, 1976; Yerxa, 1991). Historically, allied

health faculty have lagged behind the rest of the academy in this area, and occupational therapy faculty is no exception .

Research productivity has been found to be related to faculty rank, tenure status, level of degree held, and type of employing institution (Flanigan et al., 1988). Flanigan et al. reported the results of an effort to profile the research productivity of allied health faculty, including occupational therapy faculty. In a national study, it was found that doctorally-prepared tenured faculty at four-year research universities who hold the rank of professor had significantly higher levels of research productivity than other faculty. Overall, allied health faculty were found to have low levels of research productivity as measured by time spent on research, publications, presentations, and number of research projects (Flanigan et al.). The questionnaire used in the above-mentioned study was modeled after one previously used by Schiller (1985). A section of the Schiller questionnaire focused on the research environment and the factors participants believed promoted research activity within their institution.

Given this apparent relationship between the absence of a doctorate and low research productivity, Hiller and Ritvo (1991) oppose the granting of tenure to individuals who do not possess the terminal degree. Ottenbacher and Stull (1992) agree, and take it a step further to say that no individuals without doctorates should be hired for tenure-track positions. In addition, they advocate promotion to the rank of (at least) associate professor before tenure is granted. Crist (1999) mentions the need for aspiring occupational therapy educators to insure that they possess the academic credentials for the faculty role, and to determine whether the maintenance of clinical competence is

recognized and rewarded by the institution in which they plan to teach. Ottenbacher and Stull further highlight the disappointingly low hiring standards among schools of allied health during the 1990's, citing such practices as the hiring of graduate-level faculty and program directors who are not doctorally-prepared.

The apparently common practice of applying lower promotion and tenure standards to allied health faculty than is required by the rest of the academy has led, in the opinion of Ottenbacher and Stull (1992), to a loss of status among faculty members who teach in schools of allied health. They offer the opinion that these lower standards have undermined the position of such schools and given other faculty the perception that allied-health faculty are still viewed as "second-class academic citizens" (Ottenbacher & Stull, p. 2). Apparently the standards of schools of allied health in regard to these practices had not changed much between the studies conducted in the 1980's and those of the 1990's.

Holt (1991) conducted a study to identify tenure policies and criteria and describe the demographic characteristics of faculty within allied health programs. He constructed a survey instrument which achieved content validity in the opinion of a panel of experts, but which had unproven reliability. Surveys were mailed to 310 allied health programs, and were returned by 47% of participants. Response by institutional type, as defined by the Carnegie classifications, was as follows: 23 (16.9%) doctoral-degree-granting; 51 (41.2%) Comprehensive; 31 (22.8%) liberal arts colleges; and 26 (19.1%) medical/health professions schools.

Results of the Holt (1991) study showed that tenure rates, campuswide, for allied health faculty were lower (35.5%) than those of faculty as a whole (58%). Participants in the study ranked teaching as the most important criterion in the granting of tenure, a finding which is contrary to the findings of many other researchers (Conine, Schilling, & Pierce, 1985; Kraemer & Lyons, 1989; Tang & Chamberlain, 1993). A majority of respondents in the Holt study (82%), expressed the opinion that tenure criteria were becoming more rigorous, with 36% responding that this trend was coming from within allied health, as opposed to from some external agency. Success rate in achieving tenure was reported in the Holt study as highest in liberal arts colleges, with 94.3% of applicants receiving tenure. Doctoral-degree-granting institutions had the lowest success rate (79.3%) (Holt).

Elder and Nick (1995) conducted a study to determine important competencies for future doctorally-prepared allied health faculty. The thirty-six deans of schools of allied health professions who participated in their study identified 21 important competencies. These competencies were grouped according to whether they were general competencies, teaching competencies, or research competencies, with the following result. General competencies which the deans found important included the general ability to incorporate teaching, research, and patient care. The deans felt that the faculty members should be prepared to teach research skills as well as other undergraduate and graduate-level courses within the allied health discipline; be able to participate fully in the curriculum development process; and use instructional technology effectively within the classroom setting. In research, the faculty should be capable of the following: carrying out the full

spectrum of research, including competing for grant funds; designing and participating in multi-disciplinary research projects; analyzing research results; and examining the theoretical basis for clinical practice (Elder & Nick). It is interesting to note that no mention was made of the need to disseminate the research to the wider community through publication in refereed journals and presentation at national conferences.

Historical Beginnings of Occupational Therapy

To gain a better understanding of the characteristics of faculty within occupational therapy programs, it is necessary to examine the beginnings of occupational therapy. The field of occupational therapy has its roots in the philosophy of humanism and the field of humanitarianism (Reed, 1993). F. Leuret's book, *On the Moral Treatment of Insanity*, was published in 1840. This book stressed the importance of habits, exercise, drama, music, manual labor, and the development of moral consciousness for the treatment of persons with mental disorders. Thomas Story Kirkbride, M.D. became superintendent of the Pennsylvania Hospital in 1840 and began a program of care for the mentally ill that stressed occupational therapy. Kirkbride helped to organize a group which later became the American Psychiatric Association, and he did much to advance the field of occupational therapy (Tomes, 1964). The arts and crafts movement followed moral treatment, and was translated into education and therapy (Reed). Craftspersons were hired to assist patients in planning designs using media such as ceramics, weaving, and various other crafts, the products of which were saleable. The use of occupation to treat mental and physical ailments was interpreted and used in various ways by medical practitioners during the early part of the twentieth century.

The first systematic training course in occupation was developed in 1906 by Susan E. Tracy, a nurse who recognized the benefits of occupations and self determination in patient's recovery. The course description is instructive:

Each patient is considered in light of his threefold personality--body, mind and spirit.

The Aim is likewise threefold:

1. The patient's physical improvement.
2. His educational advancement.
3. His financial betterment.

The method is based upon a threefold principle:

1. The realization of resources.
2. The ability to initiate activities.
3. The participation in such activities of both sick and well subjects. (Dunton, In Reconstruction Therapy, 1919, p. 10)

Other training programs were instituted to train nurses and social service workers in the use of work as treatment. Jane Addams, director of Hull House, influenced the development of a number of courses to meet the needs of the community, including a course in occupational therapy for hospital attendants. Early training programs in occupational therapy were attended by either social workers, nurses, or kindergarten or crafts teachers. There soon developed a controversy over whether nurses were the most qualified ones to be "occupation workers", since they had medical training. Julia Lanthrop, who developed courses with Jane Addams, however, believed that "occupational treatment was to have a large future in hospital treatment and that this service should be carried on by persons specifically educated for it" (Slagle, 1938, p. 380.)

George Barton began using the term "occupational therapy" in 1914, and he helped to found the National Society for the Promotion of Occupational Therapy in 1917 (Barton, 1915 in Reed, 1993). The United States entered World War I soon afterwards, and there was a need to treat men who were injured in the fight. Several plans were submitted to the Secretary of War of the United States regarding the use of teachers and medical aids to assist in the recovery of the war wounded. In March, 1918, a call for women "reconstruction aides" in occupational therapy was issued. As a result of the war, many schools of occupational therapy were established for the education of therapists, including the department of occupational therapy and curative workshops at Walter Reed General Hospital. Two schools of occupational therapy were founded in 1919 and are still open today. These are the Boston School, now located in Tufts University, and the St. Louis School in Washington University. Advances in documenting patient's progress were made, as well as early attempts at measuring range of motion and strength. Unfortunately, the school at Walter Reed Hospital was closed due to funding cuts during the Great Depression, as were many other schools of occupational therapy (Reed, 1993).

The American Occupational Therapy Association established "Minimum Standards for Courses of Training in Occupational therapy" in 1923 (Archives of Occupational Therapy, 1924). The caliber of publications in the official journal of the Association was poor, and did not reflect a scientific basis for the profession. Articles usually fell into one of three categories, a description of the practice of occupational therapy within hospitals; helpful hints on crafts; and the relationship of occupational therapy to other services (Hopkins in Hopkins & Smith, 1983). In 1935, the "Essentials

of an Acceptable School of Occupational Therapy" were adopted, and in 1940, there remained five accredited schools of occupational therapy. Although some schools of occupational therapy were located in colleges and universities, most students did not earn a degree, choosing instead to receive specialized training in therapy without any liberal arts input, thus earning a diploma in occupational therapy (Hopkins in Hopkins & Smith).

In 1945, there were 18 accredited schools of occupational therapy, and with the entrance of the United States into World War II, demand for large numbers of therapists by the military exceeded the capacity of the existing system to supply them. At the request of the Surgeon General's Office, war emergency courses for the training of therapists were begun in a number of existing schools. An accelerated program of study was offered to college graduates who had basic psychology and at least 20 semester hours of fine, applied arts, industrial arts, or home economics. The number of registered occupational therapists went from 1144 to 2265, with women making up almost 98% of that group (Hopkins in Hopkins & Smith, 1983).

Following World War II, there was increased demand for allied health services, both in the United States and abroad. According to Mettler and Bork (1985), institutions of higher education became involved in preparing students to enter the allied health professions in response to the demands of the job market and their own economic needs. As markets expanded for practitioners of physical therapy, occupational therapy, nursing, medical technology, respiratory therapy, and other allied health professions, universities added programs in these areas (Mettler & Bork). In 1947, the University of Southern California established a master's degree program, and a similar program was also begun

at New York University. These programs were for therapists working in specialty areas of practice who desired advanced training (Hopkins in Hopkins & Smith, 1983).

During the 1950's, the focus of occupational therapy intervention shifted toward the treatment of patients with physical disabilities. Despite the increase in the number of schools of occupational therapy, demand for qualified therapists continued to exceed demand. As the need grew, persons trained in other disciplines filled occupational therapy vacancies and this led to the development of recreational therapy, art therapy, music therapy, and vocational counselors (West, 1968).

During the 1960's psychiatric treatment focused upon the social adaptation of the patient and facilitating his or her return to normal function and therapists used social interactions as therapeutic tools. As occupational therapists began working closely with psychiatrists who practiced psychotherapy, there was a need for advanced training. In 1960, there were 24 accredited schools of occupational therapy located in university settings. Gail Fidler presented graduate courses in Occupational Therapy Supervision in Psychiatry at Columbia University in 1963-64, and in 1967 she developed the master's program in Psychiatric Occupational Therapy at New York University. During this time, the first entry-level master's program was begun at the University of Southern California, followed by similar programs at Boston University and Virginia Commonwealth University. Students in these courses were encouraged to conduct research and to publish the results (Reed, 1993).

Frames of reference as the basis for occupational therapy practice were introduced during the 1970's. There was an effort to move from an intuitive approach to practice to

a more scientific model. This period marked the height of occupational therapy's use of the medical systems model and reductionist thinking, and represented a departure from the roots of the profession in an attempt to gain credibility with the medical and scientific establishment. There was tremendous diversity within the field, with roles and functions somewhat unclear, even to occupational therapy practitioners (Hopkins in Hopkins & Smith, 1983).

Occupational therapy educational programs experienced tremendous growth between the years of 1985 and 2000, both in numbers of academic programs and numbers of students. Faculty teaching within these programs were challenged to prepare increasingly larger numbers of students, while the hiring additional staff was difficult due to a shortage of qualified applicants. There are some indications that this trend has reversed, however, with the implementation of the Balanced Budget Act. Fiscal constraints upon clinical practice have served to increase the number of practitioners willing to enter the classroom, while diminishing job prospects and rates of reimbursement have stemmed the tide of students seeking admission to schools of occupational therapy. While these changes seem to have a negative impact, closer examination reveals the possibility of a positive outcome. "Rightsizing" has occurred within our profession, winnowing out those who were only there for the monetary rewards, and leaving behind those who came to the profession for other reasons. Some academic programs have closed, thus giving some relief in the area of faculty hiring as fewer faculty positions need to be filled.

Schools of allied health have not been immune from the external forces calling for increased accountability and change within higher education. The Pew Health Professions Commission Report (1995) called for "fundamental changes" to be made in the processes related to health care education (p. 27). Among the specific suggestions offered to schools of allied health were the following: 1) revision of curricula design; 2) improved articulation between programs; 3) faculty were urged to develop greater research competence and strengthen linkages to clinical practice (Pew Health Professions Commission Report).

Previous studies on occupational therapy faculty characteristics. Parham (1985) surveyed full-time occupational therapy faculty in 55 accredited baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate academic programs. Faculty from 52 institutions returned the survey, with 275 usable responses, which amounted to 73% of the total full-time faculty positions within accredited academic programs. Institutions were classified using the Carnegie Classification System, and the occupational therapy programs were grouped into five Carnegie categories, as follows: Research Universities I, 58 faculty responding; Research Universities II, 44 faculty responding; Doctoral-Granting Universities, 47 faculty responding; Comprehensive Universities and Colleges, 79 faculty responding; and Medical Schools and Medical Centers, 47 faculty responding. The highest proportion of respondents (89%) were from Research Universities I, and the lowest from Medical Schools and Centers (64%) (Parham).

Parham (1985) described occupational therapy faculty in the study mentioned above as follows: located in public, versus private institutions; with a median age of 38

years; female, in a proportion of 9:1 over male faculty; holding master's degrees and a rank of assistant professor. Only about one-third of faculty in the survey were tenured, and half had been employed by their occupational therapy programs for less than 5 years at the time of the study. Salaries were commensurate with those of faculty in higher education as a whole. Research productivity was poor among the faculty surveyed, with 70% reporting that they had not published any research studies in journals (Parham). The study did not report upon the number of faculty who had earned doctorates.

Parham and Zemke (1997) reported upon the results of a 1994 survey sponsored by the American Occupational Therapy Foundation. Academic program administrators were asked a series of questions relating to the scholarly activities of occupational therapy faculty within their institution, and the research experiences required of their students. Of interest to the present study are the results relating to research activities of the occupational therapy faculty, and the fact that the authors compared the 1994 results to those of a similar survey conducted by Parham in 1982 (Parham, 1985). There was a 55% increase in the number of occupational therapy professional programs between 1982 and 1994. Almost all of the programs surveyed reported that they had a tenure system (70 out of 73), and that one third of full-time faculty were tenured in 1994. The percentage of tenured faculty members in 1982 was similar, however there was an increase in the proportion of full-time faculty members who were not on the tenure track, increasing from 16% to 31% within the twelve year period. Publication of research was a critical factor in the tenure system of 66% of the occupational therapy programs surveyed in 1994, compared to 73% of individual faculty members surveyed in 1982. The survey

further showed that research productivity is limited among occupational therapy programs, even more so than in allied health in general. Forty percent of the responding programs reported that no data-based research articles in peer-reviewed journals were published by their faculty that academic year (1994). The authors conclude that "limited research productivity has been a long-standing characteristic of occupational therapy faculties" (Parham & Zemke, p. 626).

Fisher (1999), in an article entitled, "Reporting upon the status of occupational therapy education in the 90's", focuses upon teaching competencies and the move to graduate programs as the entry-level for the profession. She calls for occupational therapy educators to "justify the nature of their field as a true field of inquiry" (p. 8), but does not mention the need for faculty to engage in research projects. Instead, educators are urged to "include research and theory-based content within the occupational therapy curriculum". In other words, occupational therapy faculty do not have to actually engage in research, but they should be able to talk about the work done by others. This emphasis upon teaching over research seems somewhat incongruent with the missions of the institutions in which most occupational therapy programs are located. One cannot earn tenure and promotion simply by reporting upon the research efforts of others, no matter how interestingly the content is presented.

Case-Smith (1999) conducted a qualitative study in which she interviewed nine successful occupational therapy researchers to determine how these faculty members had established their research programs, and to ask for advice for aspiring faculty/researchers. Participants in the study offered the following advice: 1) Complete a doctoral education

that emphasizes research; 2) Find mentors; 3) Find colleagues with similar research interests; 4) Read the literature, analyze practice, think critically; 5) Create a linkage between research and other faculty roles; 6) Learn the research funding systems; 7) Learn to accept criticism; 8) Prioritize work time; 9) Generate a 10-year research plan, with multiple small steps; and 10) Enjoy the process (Case-Smith).

There have been efforts made within allied health in general, and occupational therapy specifically, to apply Boyer's (1990) broadened definition of scholarship within the academy. In the January-February 1999 issue of the American Occupational Therapy Journal which focused upon education, the editor called for application of Boyer's work within schools of occupational therapy, and noted that demand for qualified graduate-level faculty has exceeded supply (Nolinske, 1999). She also noted the lack of research productivity of occupational therapy faculty, and called for increased financial support for these endeavors from the national organization. In light of the economic difficulties experienced by the profession during the last few years, it seems unlikely that association funding for research will increase anytime soon.

Angstadt, Nieman, and Morahan (1998) describe strategies employed by one school of health sciences to raise promotion and tenure standards through a revision of the traditional definition of scholarship. They applied Boyer's (1990) work in *Scholarship Revisited*, and Diamond's (1993) definition of scholarship and his guidelines to promotion and tenure review committees to the health professions, and began a process of redefining the definition of "scholarly activity" within their institution (Angstadt et al., 1998, p. 157). Boyer's categories of scholarship include the scholarship of discovery,

which is traditional scholarly activity; scholarship of teaching; the scholarship of application, such as clinical practice; and the scholarship of integration, which seems to relate to clinical reasoning. Diamond identifies scholarship as innovative activities that require a high level of expertise, that can be replicated or elaborated upon; which can be peer reviewed; and have an impact upon the discipline or some other community of people. One recommendation of the Angstadt et al. study was the need for expectations of faculty productivity to focus upon either teaching or research, but not both. The end result of the process was the revision of promotion and tenure guidelines to reflect an expanded view of scholarly activity which recognizes the unique needs of faculty within academic programs.

A study of recent occupational therapy literature shows that efforts have been made to facilitate the transition of practitioners from clinical settings to academic programs (Brayley, 1996; Crist, 1999; Nolinske, 1999). The American Occupational Therapy Foundation sponsors a workshop at the American Occupational Therapy Association's annual conference called the "Academic Juggling Act", which is a resource for faculty role development. Pat Crist, a well-known academic educator, has written columns for *OT Advance* and published articles in *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy* addressing topics such as career transition, faculty roles, and the need to find an institution whose philosophy is congruent with that of the potential faculty member's beliefs (Crist, 1999; Crist, 1993a; Crist, 1993b; Crist, 1993c; Crist, 1993d; Crist, 1993e; Crist, 1993f; Crist, 1993g).

Crepeau, Thibodaux, and Parham (1999) reviewed higher education literature related to faculty socialization processes for entering and sustaining a career in academe, and related that literature to issues in occupational therapy education. The process of earning a doctorate can help to prepare potential faculty members for academia. Others have said that doctoral programs serve to initiate students into a particular discipline, establish professional identity, and provide a socialization experience (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoades, 1993).

Arreola (1998) proposed a procedure for developing a faculty evaluation system which has been used by several occupational therapy programs. Under his plan, faculty and administrators design and develop a process which matches the values and needs of the individual institution in which the program is located. The processes of faculty evaluation and faculty development are linked, so that resources exist to facilitate to develop the performance areas in which they are to be evaluated. If the system is followed, numeric scores are obtained and used to compute ratings for the various faculty roles of teaching, research, and service, as agreed upon by the participants. These data can be used for annual evaluation as well as for promotion and tenure decisions. Arreola emphasizes that the system must be unique to each individual institution in order to be effectively used.

Current Debate on Viability of Traditional Tenure

Through the years, there have been numerous attempts made by organizations concerned with higher education to study tenure. In 1969, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, together with the American Council on Education, conducted a study

of tenure within American institutions of higher education (Keast, 1973). A Commission on Academic Tenure was formed in 1971 to study tenure policies, and resulted in the redefinition of tenure as follows:

An arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement for age or physical disability, subject to dismissal for adequate cause or unavoidable termination on account of financial exigency or change of institutional program (Habecker, 1981, p. 83).

According to Metzger (1979), debate concerning the merits of tenure is as old as tenure itself. In his opinion, arguments about tenure center upon the permanency of tenure. The professor is essentially granted lifetime employment. This assertion is refuted by many in academia, however, no data is available to show how many tenured professors have been fired from their positions (Perley, 1995; Trower, 1999). O'Toole (1979) felt that tenure leads to faculty immobility, impairs personal growth, and decreases the quality of teaching and research productivity.

More recently, and in recognition of a growing national debate over tenure, the American Association for Higher Education established the New Pathways Project to explore emerging career paths and employment arrangements of the professoriate for the 21st century (Licata & Morreale, 1997). The products of this project are published in the series, New Pathways: Faculty Career and Employment for the 21st Century Working Paper Series, and there are currently fourteen papers available.

The Faculty Policy Review Project is a study of tenure conducted by a consortium of several groups representing campus administrators and trustees, but no faculty members. Their study resulted in the report, Facing Change: Building the faculty of the

future (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1999), which offers recommendations in the areas of *faculty employment policies, faculty development policies, and faculty review policies*. The stated purposes of the project were to "take a proactive approach in preparing the workforce and the workplace for the 21st century" (p. 7), and to address the concerns of the public regarding the "efficiency, effectiveness and affordability of public higher education institutions" (p. 7). While there were no recommendations made concerning changes to the administrative component, recommendations to faculty were as follows: In the area of *faculty employment*, they recommended that tenure should be retained; that part-time faculty should be compensated on the same basis as full-time faculty; that performance-based reviews should occur. *Faculty development* policy changes mentioned included linking faculty development to the mission and goals of the employing institution; increasing the weight of teaching ability in tenure and promotion decisions; making faculty development opportunities available to part-time faculty; increasing accountability for sabbatical leaves; and recognition of the contributions of faculty engaged in expanding the use of technology. The report expressed the belief that improved management of human resources offers a great opportunity for change, particularly in the area of *faculty review*. Recommendations were for post-tenure faculty review at all institutions; annual performance evaluations which link to the faculty role and reward systems; analysis of the impact of the application of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA); and more selective pursuit of accreditation to reflect the institution's mission (American Association of State Colleges and Universities).

Chait (1998), in an essay about the priorities of the professoriate, cites numerous academicians, leaders of major universities who came up through the faculty ranks, who have stated that the current system of tenure is no longer viable, and must be changed. Attacks on tenure and on those who would continue it are commonly seen in the popular media. Many academicians agree that the present system cannot survive, and they prefer to have some control over the process, rather than stand by while outsiders make the decisions for them. The consensus of opinion seems to be that, if we do not make the changes ourselves, others will make them for us, or they will simply occur while we are otherwise occupied (Trower, 1999). Breneman (1997) has pointed out that while all the arguments concerning tenure fly around, the system is quietly changing and evolving.

Proposed Alternatives to Tenure

Despite the fact that Trower (1996) reported that 31% of respondents to the AAHE survey reported that no changes to the traditional tenure system were under consideration at their institutions, the public debate around tenure has yielded the formulation of several alternatives to tenure. It seems inevitable that tenure will change in some form, however it is not known what form the "new tenure" will take (Breneman, 1997). Alternatives to tenure identified in the AAHE survey memorandum consisted of the following: changing the duration of probationary periods, introducing "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions during the probationary periods, waiving the "up or out" provision, imposing or lifting tenure quotas, using long-term nontenure-track appointments, tying tenure to a specified base salary, offering faculty inducements to forego or relinquish tenure, redefining the criteria to terminate tenured faculty due to

"financial exigency" or "program discontinuation", redefining the locus of tenure, and instituting post-tenure review processes (Trower).

Gappa (1996) reported a study about alternatives to tenure in which interviews were conducted with administrators, senior faculty, and full-time nontenured faculty at seven institutions. She identified six models currently in use: teaching appointments, professors of practice, research professors, distinguished senior lecturers, limited tenure situations, and integrated tenurable and nontenurable tracks in medical schools. She also addressed key underlying themes at these seven institutions, including campus climate, culture, history, traditions, and tenured faculty attitudes (Gappa).

Chait (1998) proposes several modifications to tenure. Rather than abolish tenure, he suggests several changes to tenure which might be acceptable to all stakeholders in the current tenure debate. The first, which he calls "tenure by objectives" (p. 5), attempts to change some aspects of the tenure process which have been cited by faculty members as causing stress (Chait). He suggests removing some of the secrecy and uncertainty from the tenure application process through the establishment of a review committee which provides feedback and guidance to the tenure-track faculty member throughout the probationary period. In addition, he advocates the use of explicit performance criteria and performance-based agreements in which the expectations for the faculty member's demonstration of competence are spelled out during the first year of employment on the tenure-track, and form the basis for subsequent performance evaluations through the probationary period. The faculty member would be given feedback regarding whether he or she were making satisfactory progress toward attaining

tenure, thus eliminating any surprises at the end of the probationary period (Chait).

Included in this proposal is the possibility of extending the length of the probationary period as needed in order to allow the candidate time to achieve his or her objectives (Chait).

A second revision to the tenure process proposed by Chait (1998), is called "post-tenure review", however, it bears little resemblance to any type of post-tenure review process commonly seen. Chait argues that, 1) since it is expensive to conduct extensive periodic reviews of tenured faculty, and 2) since nothing will be done with the information anyway, reviews should be conducted at the departmental level. He cites the Northwestern University model of self-review as an exemplary one. Chait seems to think that the public outcry against tenure will be appeased by such a process, thereby avoiding any real performance-based review of tenure faculty.

Some institutions operate without tenure. Some have never had tenure, while some have abolished the system (Trower, 1996). Fifteen percent of institutions in the AAHE study reported having no tenure system (Trower). Faculty at these institutions typically receive multi-year or rolling contracts (Trower). Chait and Trower (1997) conducted a study which examined private colleges which operate without tenure. These institutions comprise 9% of the total number of private colleges. Some of the institutions operated without tenure in any form, called "purebreds" in the study, and some offered tenure as an alternative to nontenure-track positions, called "hybrids" in the study (p. 2.). They found that institutions without tenure may use contractual arrangements which resemble tenure, as far as providing economic security for faculty. Contracts at these

institutions typically had three common aspects, as follows: all appointments were for a specified length of time; the contracts are renewable; and the intervals were variable, based upon seniority and rank (Chait & Trower,).

Post-tenure performance review was first introduced by the National Commission on Higher Education (1982) as an issue which was critical to higher education. Since that time, post-tenure review has been mandated or strongly recommended by law or by governing boards, and exists today in some thirty states (Licata & Morreale, 1997; Trower, 1996). The goals of post-tenure review, as summarized by Licata and Morreale are as follows: 1) comprehensive assessment of performance; 2) significant involvement of peers in review; 3) establishment of professional goals and consideration of career direction; and 4) provision of meaningful feedback and opportunity for improvement. Most academicians oppose the use of post-tenure review for the purposes of dismissal or disciplinary sanction of tenured faculty (Licata & Morreale). This appears to be in direct opposition to calls for increased accountability from the public sector, some of whom hold the view that tenured faculty are not performing satisfactorily and should be disciplined or dismissed (Licata & Morreale; Trower, 1999).

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) conducted a survey of 280 higher education institutions on tenure policies, practices, and trends in an effort to ascertain the status of tenure, as perceived by provosts of the institutions surveyed (Trower, 1996). Participants were sent a "Dear Colleague" memorandum in which they were asked to indicate whether their campus had considered or implemented any modifications to traditional tenure practices. Trower reports that 29% of the institutions

responding to the AAHE survey already had policies for post-tenure review in place, and an additional 6% were considering them. The average post-tenure review cycle at the institutions surveyed was five years, with the majority occurring automatically at a time set out in the review policy (Trower). Many institutions' post-tenure review policies were described by respondents as "rather toothless", "lacking substance", and "cursory at best" (Trower, p. 2).

Suess (1995) conducted a survey upon the attitudes of nurse-faculty toward post-tenure performance reviews. In a nationwide sample of 248 nurses, she found that attitude toward post-tenure review was not significantly related to variables of tenure status, perceived productivity in teaching, service, scholarship, internal motivation, age, teaching experience, gender, educational preparation, or faculty rank. Participants in the study were primarily female (96%), with a mean age of 47 years, 52% held doctoral degrees, 68% were tenured with varying ranks. Mean years of teaching experience was 9.39 years (Suess).

Suess (1995) used a four-part questionnaire to collect data. Three parts of the questionnaire were researcher-developed, and the fourth was adapted from an existing instrument that measured internal motivation. Demographic data were gathered on age, gender, highest earned degree, years of teaching experience, rank, tenure status, administrative roles, and programs offered in current schools. A 52-item Self-Rating Instrument asked faculty to rate themselves in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship as to how they were functioning in comparison to perceived expectations in their own nursing schools, using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from functioning

"much lower than expected" to functioning "much higher than expected" (Suess, p. 26).

A 16-item Attitudes Toward Post-Tenure Evaluation Instrument consisted of two sections. Section A asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements reflecting both positive and negative aspects of a post-tenure review process while Section B consisted of five questions that related to how the respondent felt about a post-tenure evaluation process in his or her own school of nursing. In test-retest reliability testing, the Self-Rating and the Attitudes Instruments instruments achieved a "high degree of reliability" according to Suess.

Of the alternatives to traditional tenure mentioned above, the second most prevalent change reported in the AAHE study (Trower, 1996), after post-tenure review, was the creation of long-term nontenure-track appointments for faculty. Twenty-four (24) percent of the 280 respondent institutions reported policies for these type faculty employment contracts. Long-term contracts may assume a variety of forms, including renewable or nonrenewable term appointments (multi-year contracts), rolling contracts, and continuing contracts (Trower). Hiller and Ritvo (1991) advocate the use of such multi-year contracts in lieu of tenure at schools of allied health.

Some institutions offer inducements to faculty who agree to forego tenure. These may be in the form of faculty development leave, bonuses, and a higher rate of pay than tenure-track faculty (Trower, 1996). Faculty members may place a higher value upon sabbatical leaves, or a lower teaching load, than upon the attainment of tenure (Keith, 1997). In a contract system with tenure as one option among many, faculty would be free to negotiate for whatever they value most, thus giving them an employment package

tailored to the individual faculty member, rather than the "one size fits all" model currently advocated by some.

The prevalence of the use of part-time faculty has increased, as institutions look for ways to increase productivity and decrease costs. According to the U.S. Department of Education (1999), the proportion of part-time faculty nearly doubled, from 22 to 41 percent, over the twenty year period from 1975 to 1995. Of total faculty employed in 1995, only 19 percent of full-time faculty were on the tenure track, compared with 28 percent in 1975. In 1995, almost two-thirds of faculty members at two-year institutions and one-third at four-year institutions were part time. The 1997 IPEDS data reported that of the nearly one million faculty members working full and part-time in postsecondary institutions, 42.5 percent worked part-time. Forty-seven percent of these part-time faculty members were women (U.S. Department of Education).

In addition, most undergraduate teaching is done by non-tenured faculty, most of which work part-time. Some individuals, known as "freeway flyers", teach a single class at several different institutions in order to make a living (Nuchims, 1995; Richardson, 1999). These positions are usually compensated at a much lower rate of pay than comparable tenure-track positions. The fact that these individuals are willing to work without the benefits of tenure, or even without a long-term contract, seems to indicate that the employment relationships between institutions of higher learning and faculty members will become more diverse in nature in the future. Some observers argue that these changes in employment options may benefit faculty members as much as the institutions at which they are employed (Trower, 1999).

If tenure is needed to protect academic freedom, how is it safeguarded at these institutions which have no tenure system? Respondents in the AAHE study cite policy, statute, and litigation as means to insure academic freedom (Trower, 1996). It should be remembered that the respondents in the above-mentioned study were not faculty, but administrators. Faculty members in the study conducted by Keith (1997) said that if tenure were eliminated, it would mean less job security for faculty. They further stated that the protection of academic freedom at their institutions depended upon "themselves, the tenure system, culture and traditions, and their administrations" (p. 16). Byrne (1997) suggested that, lacking tenure, the best guarantee of academic freedom and due process is through faculty contracts, enforceable in a court of law. When Chait & Trower (1997) asked the question of whether contractual agreements at private colleges without tenure provided academic freedom for faculty, they found that most institutions addressed the issue within the faculty handbook. Some included the 1940 AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom, and most expressly extended academic freedom to all faculty, regardless of contractual status, length of service, or rank (Chait & Trower). In recognition of the fact that increasing numbers of faculty members cannot rely upon tenure to preserve their academic freedom within the classroom, the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) New Pathways Project asked Martin Michaelson, a former counsel to Harvard, to codify principles of academic freedom for a faculty handbook (Chait, 1998). This follows the suggestions given by Byrne.

Some sixteen percent of institutions in the AAHE survey reported the existence of provisions whereby a faculty member may "stop-the-tenure-clock" (Trower, 1996, p. 6).

These provisions allow tenure-track faculty who are still on probationary status to stop the tenure clock for a period of time, typically one year, while still remaining on the tenure track. The most frequently cited reasons to enact this privilege were pregnancy or family leave. The AAUP Statement on Tenure is in opposition to lengthening the probationary period of faculty for any reason (Baez & Centra, 1995). Female faculty are often forced to delay childbearing or to choose between their careers and parenthood, as a result of these policies. In some cases, women have lost their jobs when they have chosen to have children during their probationary period, thus decreasing their scholarly productivity (Finkel & Olswang, 1996). The demands on dual-career faculty with children are great, and department chairs and tenured faculty may not support the need to fulfill the role of caregiver or parent (Gappa & MacDermid, 1997). Gappa and MacDermid report that some institutions offer "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions only informally, and not as a part of formal policy. Faculty may be reluctant to take advantage of these provisions, fearing they will be penalized at the time of tenure application (Gappa and MacDermid).

Economic Aspects of Tenure

An economic aspect of the tenure debate is the supply and demand issue. In short, supply exceeds demand, in the marketplace of tenure-track faculty positions. Among the possible causes of this imbalance is the fact that tenure-track positions are being held for longer periods of time by an aging group of faculty who are choosing to retire later. Bowen and Schuster (1986) estimated that between the years 1985 and 2009, about two-thirds of the entire faculty of 1985 would need to be replaced, with the bulk of

the hiring to begin in 1995. Chronister, Baldwin, and Conley (1997) report a study by the National Center for Education Statistics, done in 1993, which addressed faculty member's plans for retirement, as well as their plans to leave higher education for other jobs. They found that the average age of full-time faculty members was 48 years old in 1992, contrasted with 47 years old in 1987. About one-fourth of full-time faculty members were 55 or older. In the fall of 1992, 7 percent of full-time instructional faculty indicated they were very likely to retire from the labor force in the next 3 years. The largest group of full-time faculty planning to retire during this time period were tenured full professors. More than one-half of all full-time faculty said they planned to retire between the ages of 60 and 70, but a large number of full-time faculty, 30 percent of the total, did not know when they would retire. Twenty-eight percent indicated they would be willing to take early retirement.

In 1994, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) was applied to higher education, thus "uncapping" the working years of tenured faculty (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1999). At the same time that older faculty are postponing retirement, an overly abundant supply of doctorally-prepared applicants exists in many fields today (Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, 1996). For these and other reasons, some authorities have argued that the existence of tenure depresses academic salaries (Finkin, 1996; Breneman, 1997). Many individuals who have earned a Ph.D. are accepting non-tenure track positions or are leaving academia for industry, due to a lack of openings in tenure-track positions. Those who are fortunate enough to secure a tenure-track appointment find that they are bound by the "up or out"

rule, in which they receive a terminal contract if they fail to earn tenure during their probationary period. The reality is that an individual who is denied tenure at one institution will have difficulty finding another tenure-track position (Breneman). Breneman argues that young faculty members may prefer a non-tenure track, term appointment rather than risk being "banished from academic employment early in their careers" if the institution wishes to terminate the employment contract. He also points out that this shifts the risk from the institution to the faculty member, thus providing economic incentive for the practice.

Gappa and Leslie (1997) suggest that the practice of hiring faculty to teach without benefit of tenure creates a dual labor market within academia. The existence of differing employment practices within a single institution is the subject of a paper they published, in which they also examine the impact of such practices upon educational quality. According to Gappa and Leslie (1993):

The reason for the two faculties is that the one sustains the other: The low costs and heavy undergraduate teaching loads of the have-nots help make possible the continuation of a tenure system that protects the jobs and perquisites of the haves. (p. 2)

According to Montagna (1977), dual labor market theory emerged as economists related poverty to occupational structure. The dual market is composed of the *primary market*, in which certain groups have favored status in matters of recruitment, promotion, and training, and the *secondary market*, where the jobs are low-paying, have little opportunity for advancement, and a relationship between workers and supervisors that allows for capricious and arbitrary treatment (Montagna). Dual labor markets tend to

exist in institutions which favor and insulate the primary work force from competition (Sakamoto & Chen, 1991).

Gappa and Leslie (1997) assert that tenure systems "appear to have characteristics of a dual labor market" (p. 6). During the post-World War II educational boom, universities were in competition for qualified faculty who would yield prestige and income from research. Gappa and Leslie suggest that this was the era during which tenure systems were used to insure that only the most productive faculty members were continued in employment past the probationary period. Faculty gained "economic security, intellectual freedom, control over their own working conditions and productivity, and the prospect of protection from market volatility in their own employment" (Gappa & Leslie, p. 7). This system depended upon increased tuition and federal and state appropriations in order to continue. The current fiscal environment will no longer support such a system, so universities are faced with the necessity of devising a means to control costs while increasing productivity. Tenured faculty have become the "primary market", and expect to be maintained as a "protected and privileged work force" (p. 7). When coupled with the fact that fewer numbers of older tenured faculty are retiring due to the repeal of the mandatory retirement rules, it is easy to see how such a situation developed within the academic marketplace. Institutions must employ a secondary work force made up of part-time untenured faculty to maintain standards of productivity. There apparently is no shortage of people willing to work without long-term contracts for comparatively low wages (Gappa & Leslie).

Gappa & Leslie (1997) offer the opinion that this dual labor market cannot be sustained in the long term. They advise tenured faculty to increase their productivity and to take responsibility for ensuring the quality of instruction within their institutions. In short, they propose an economic solution to what is essentially an economic problem. They propose changes in the way universities deal with part-time faculty in matters of appointments, teaching assignments, support and services, recruitment, salaries, benefits, job security, and status. These are all factors which, when poorly handled by the institution, can undermine quality and decrease performance incentives for part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie).

Breneman (1997) argues that higher education does not deserve to occupy such a privileged position within society, insulated from economic and societal changes. He cites the external forces which shaped higher education during the last century, such as the Morrill Act, the GI Bill, the Civil Rights movement, expanded access and equity for women and minorities, and the growth of community colleges (Breneman). In Breneman's opinion, the major forces shaping higher education today are economic ones - so-called "market forces" (p. 2). Well-endowed institutions have become richer during the past few years, with annual returns on investments reaching previously unseen high percentages. For these institutions, according to Breneman, "the tenure discussion may take a different form" (p.3). He asserts that the need to offer alternatives to tenure is lessened in these circumstances, since the potential gain to the institutions is perceived to be less. He mentions that the repeal of mandatory retirement could change this situation however, if large numbers of tenured faculty choose not to retire at the age of 70. In that

event, the university may try to offer inducements in the form of early retirement incentives or reduced teaching loads.

Anyone currently involved in educating students at any age or educational level can attest to the veracity of the fact that financial concerns drive policy in the current educational climate. Within the field of medicine and allied health, these economic forces take the form of decreasing compensation for patient care, and reduced demand for certain specialties. Decreased funding from state legislatures has challenged many schools to seek alternative funding sources and to find ways to cut costs. Coupled with the decreased funding is the demand for services during expanded hours and in non-traditional settings and formats (Dillman, Christenson, Salant, & Warner, 1995; Heydinger & Simsek, 1992). In light of these recent developments, Breneman's discussion of alternatives to traditional tenure seems particularly relevant. The idea that each institution should examine faculty employment options in order to determine the most appropriate ones to suit its unique institutional environment, is congruent with occupational therapy philosophy.

Relationship of the Proposed Study to the Literature

The literature reviewed has shown that tenure is a deeply rooted tradition of academia which evokes strong reactions from administrators and faculty members. External calls for changes to the traditional system have been viewed as threats to the status quo, and have caused a polarization of opinion concerning the future course of employment practices within institutions of higher education. There is some indication

that faculty as a whole favor the continuation of traditional tenure, although no study could be found which stated this fact in a definitive way.

There is variability among tenure criteria for faculty as a whole, and those who teach within occupational therapy academic programs. While research productivity appears to be the essential criteria for tenure in most of academia, this does not appear to be the case within schools of allied health and occupational therapy. Occupational therapy faculty reflect the diversity of their profession in regards to demographic characteristics, educational level, and emphasis upon teaching over research. Rooted in pragmatism and humanism, schools of occupational therapy have attempted to meet the demands of the marketplace for increased numbers of therapists, and have neglected the formulation of a unified theoretical base, rooted in research. They have been so busy "doing" that they have not taken enough time to reflect, publish, explain, and justify their actions through scientific inquiry. This lack of a research history has put occupational therapy faculty at odds with the rest of the academy, and has created a gap between them and other faculty. This study attempted to ascertain whether these differences between occupational therapy faculty and their colleagues in academe has any effect upon their attitudes toward tenure.

METHOD

Research Design

The survey method of research was employed in order to obtain the largest amount of information from the largest available population. The perceived advantages of the use of survey research for this project included the following: availability of a current sampling frame; nominal cost, when compared with other direct methods of data collection; and suitability for collecting data regarding attitudes (Kerlinger, 1986). Disadvantages included the limitations inherent in the survey method of research, such as an inability to verify the identity of actual survey respondents, and the possibility that the meaning of questions will be misinterpreted, yielding an unreliable response. The data were collected through mailed surveys administered in a cross-sectional time frame.

Population of the Study

The population for the study consisted of faculty teaching in accredited or developing occupational therapy professional programs within the United States who have identified their primary work setting as "Academic" on the current American Occupational Therapy Association annual membership survey. Accreditation status was determined according to the Listing of Educational Programs in Occupational therapy, as published in Volume 54, No. 6 of the American Journal of Occupational Therapy, pages 649-660. The following definition was applied:

Accreditation: "The program is in substantial compliance with the Essentials and Guidelines for an Accredited Educational Program for the Occupational Therapist/Therapy Assistant or Standards for an Accredited Educational Program for the Occupational Therapist/Therapy Assistant" (AOTA, 2000, p. 649).

At the time of this study, there were 154 accredited or developing occupational therapy professional programs within the United States. Of these, 138 were accredited and sixteen held developing program status.

Sample and Sampling Procedures

It was the researcher's understanding that, according to the American Occupational Therapy Association, 1318 registered occupational therapists were identified as working within an academic setting when responding to a survey which accompanied the 1999/2000 membership invoices. However, the American Occupational Therapy Association was unable to differentiate among registered occupational therapists and occupational therapy assistants responding to the membership survey. Therefore, the actual list available to the researcher contained both occupational therapists and occupational therapy assistants, and numbered 1628. Three complete sets of address labels containing the names and home addresses of these 1628 persons were purchased by the researcher from the AOTA. Upon examination of the address labels, the researcher inferred that eleven persons on the list were occupational therapy assistants or were currently employed within occupational therapy assistant programs. Since these participants did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the study, their names were eliminated from the list and no survey packets were mailed to them. Twelve persons' names were removed from the list because they participated in the preliminary survey validation process. Elimination of these names resulted in 1605 persons remaining in the

population. The suggested sample size for a .95 confidence level for a population of 1600 is 310 subjects, assuming a return rate of 19% (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). To maximize the final sample size, a survey packet was mailed to each one of the 1605 members of the population.

The survey packet consisted of the following items: a cover letter, explaining the purpose of the research and stating that return of the survey constitutes consent on the part of participants; a questionnaire to obtain information regarding the characteristics of the participant, including academic rank, clinical or tenure-track status, full or part-time status, institutional type, and length of time spent in academia; the TASI, described below; and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. Participants were also given the option of receiving a summary of the survey results by e-mail, should they so desire. A copy of all materials sent to participants, including the cover letter, questionnaire, instrument, and follow-up postcard is contained in Appendix A, B, C, and D, respectively.

In order to track responses to the survey, a unique identification number was assigned to each participant. This four-digit number appeared on each information questionnaire and the TASI. A roster of all participants, including name, address, and identification number was created prior to the initial mailing. Upon return of each survey, the roster was updated to contain only the non-respondent participants' information. Respondents were subsequently identified by number only, to help insure confidentiality. Following completion of the study, all materials containing participants' names and addresses were destroyed by shredding.

Survey Response

The researcher mailed out packets to 1605 persons, who were identified by the American Occupational Therapy Association as occupational therapists or occupational therapy assistants working in academia. The researcher originally proposed that non-respondents receive a letter and a duplicate survey two weeks following the initial mailing. However, after two weeks, 849 surveys had been returned to the researcher, for a rate of 52.9% overall and the researcher determined that it was not necessary to mail out another complete packet. Therefore, 756 non-respondents received a postcard reminder with information on how to receive another survey, should they desire it. After receiving the postcard reminder, a total of ten participants requested duplicate survey packets, and eight participants responded by e-mail that they had already returned their surveys. Three participants responded by e-mail that they were no longer working in academia, and were removed from the list. An additional 186 surveys were returned by mail, for a total return of 1035 surveys, a rate of 62.9%.

Analysis of characteristics reported by the respondents showed that 437 respondents did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the study population; with 325 not employed in academia; and 112 employed in academia, but who did not meet other criteria for inclusion, such as teaching in an occupational therapy academic program. Therefore the population was determined to consist of 1168 persons, after removal of the 437 persons described above who did not meet population inclusion criteria. The suggested sample size for a .95 confidence level for a population of 1100 is 285 subjects (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Twenty-eight surveys were returned incomplete, and seven

were completely blank. Of the returned surveys, 577 respondents met all criteria for inclusion in the study, yielding a usable rate of 49%. These 577 surveys comprised the sample used for data analysis. Of the 577 survey responses analyzed, 13 were incomplete and 564 responses were complete. Therefore, not all categories of responses will total 577.

Instrumentation

Participants in the study were asked to return a questionnaire and the Tenure Attitude Survey Instrument (TASI). The survey instrument, TASI, is an original instrument created by the researcher for the purpose of this study, and initially consisted of 35 items (See Appendix E). Survey items were constructed based upon a review of the higher education literature on issues related to tenure and alternatives to tenure, to seek positive and negative attitudes toward tenure, according to the following six constructs: 1) continuation of traditional tenure (Items 7, 13, 17, 21, 23, 24, 28, 31); 2) academic freedom protection (Items 1,8,14,18); 3) job security protection (Items 4, 15, 25, 29, 32, 35); 4) attitude toward changing the duration of probationary periods (Items 9, 19, 22, 26); 5) attitude toward long-term nontenure-track appointments (Items 5, 6, 10, 27, 33); 6) attitude toward post-tenure review(Items 2, 11, 16, 30, 34).

A 7-point Likert-type scale was used. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with declarative items reflective of positive and negative attitudes toward current issues related to tenure and alternatives to tenure. Response choices consisted of (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) somewhat disagree;

(4) neutral or no opinion; (5) somewhat agree; (6) agree; and (7) strongly agree. The TASI was revised through the process described below.

Validity

Preliminary face validity, and content validity of the survey instrument were established through a series of reviews by a panel of faculty members prior to mailing the survey. Seventeen occupational therapy faculty members, as well as four higher education faculty, were asked to review the demographic questionnaire and TASI. Feedback was sought regarding readability, clarity, content, length, and any additional general comments and suggestions, (See Appendix G and Appendix H for cover letter and feedback form, respectively).

In a further attempt to determine content validity of the TASI prior to data collection, the researcher created a sort procedure for use by the panel of occupational therapy faculty members. Seventeen faculty members in occupational therapy performed the sort, in which the thirty-two survey items were matched to six constructs, as follows: 1) continuation of traditional tenure, 2) academic freedom protection, 3) job security protection, 4) attitude toward changing the duration of probationary periods, 5) attitude toward long-term nontenure-track appointments, and 6) attitude toward post-tenure review. These six constructs were mounted individually on 3" x 5" index cards, as were the thirty-two survey items related to the constructs, as listed above. Three survey items were considered general ones, and were not included in the sort procedure.

Participants were asked to assign items to one construct, exclusively. Subjective comments regarding the items were noted, and results of the sort were recorded by the

researcher on the Score Sheet for Guided Sort Form (See Appendix F). An analysis of the results of the sort was performed in which each item was analyzed according to construct assigned by the participants, and percentages were calculated as to agreement. Table 1 presents the percentages of agreement among the faculty panel.

Table 1

TASI Construct-Item Agreement (All numbers are percentages.)

Constructs	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Item 1	-----	6	88	-----	6	-----
Item 2	-----	6	-----	88	6	-----
Item 4	-----	53	6	-----	35	6
Item 5	-----	18	-----	-----	12	71
Item 6	-----	29	6	-----	65	-----
Item 7	-----	6	12	-----	77	6
Item 8	-----	12	77	-----	6	6
Item 9	100	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Item 10	-----	18	-----	-----	47	35
Item 11	-----	-----	6	88	6	-----
Item 13	-----	-----	-----	-----	100	-----
Item 14	-----	6	82	-----	12	-----
Item 15	-----	82	-----	-----	12	6
Item 16	-----	18	-----	82	-----	-----
Item 17	-----	6	-----	-----	29	65

Item 18	-----	6	94	-----	-----	-----
Item 19	94	-----	-----	-----	6	-----
Item 21	-----	-----	-----	-----	65	35
Item 22	88	-----	-----	-----	6	6
Item 23	-----	29	-----	-----	71	-----
Item 24	-----	6	6	-----	82	6
Item 25	-----	53	-----	-----	47	-----
Item 26	82	-----	-----	-----	12	6
Item 27	-----	24	-----	6	18	53
Item 28	-----	6	-----	6	47	41
Item 29	-----	47	-----	6	41	6
Item 30	-----	18	6	71	6	-----
Item 31	-----	29	-----	-----	24	47
Item 32	-----	47	-----	12	24	18
Item 33	-----	12	-----	-----	35	53
Item 34	-----	18	-----	82	-----	-----
Item 35	-----	18	65	-----	18	-----

Subjective comments included the following suggestions: 1) Reorder the Likert scale choices; 2) Include definitions of academic freedom, clinical faculty, post-tenure review, probationary period, and tenure; 3) Make the TASI two pages long, for improved readability; 4) Clarify if respondents may check more than one category on the

demographic questionnaire; 5) Items 29 and 32 do not seem appropriate for the content; and 6) Reword Items 13, 24, and 33.

It was decided by the researcher to omit items 29 and 32 from the final version of the TASI. Items 13, 24, and 33 were reworded with the assistance of the research advisor. Likert-scale choices were reordered. Definitions were added to the bottom of the demographic questionnaire, and respondents were directed to "check all that apply". The survey was kept to one page in length, thus rejecting the suggestion to make it two pages long.

Ten of the original seventeen occupational therapy faculty members were shown the revised demographic questionnaire and TASI and asked to evaluate the changes made as a result of feedback. Eight of the ten expressed the belief that the changes had improved the overall validity of the survey, with two faculty members saying that they had not recommended any changes in the first place, and so could not comment upon them. A copy of the revised TASI, as mailed to participants, is contained in Appendix C.

The criteria used to retain items as representative of a particular construct was that there should be at least 50% agreement among participants regarding placement (See Table 1). Some items were retained, but were moved to different constructs; such was the case with items 17 and 35. Construct 1, changing the duration of probationary periods had the highest level of agreement of all the constructs, followed by academic freedom (construct 3, above) and post-tenure review (construct 4, above). There was some evidence that the concepts about tenure which were represented by items related to job security protection (construct 2, above), continuation of traditional tenure (construct 5,

above), and long-term nontenure-track appointments (construct 6, above), were not easily separated by the participants, as seen in the ratings of items.

Following approval of the research proposal by the student's research committee, approval to conduct the research described herein was sought and obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the University of North Texas. Following data collection, the data were coded, entered into Excel and imported into SPSS.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to verify and provide final definitions of variables and structure of the obtained scores (Henson & Roberts, in press; Thompson & Daniel, 1996). A correlational matrix of associations was analyzed, and the principal components analysis method of factor extraction with varimax rotation was used in an attempt to remove the shared variance from the original matrix of associations. Multiple criteria were employed to determine the number of retained factors, including the eigenvalue greater than one rule, scree test, and parallel analysis (Henson & Roberts, in press).

This process consisted of the generation of a matrix of associations based upon random data. Eigenvalues of the random data were compared to the matrix of associations of the actual raw data. Factors which had eigenvalues less than the random factor eigenvalues were rejected. This analysis suggested the existence of five factors, with component one accounting for 26% of variance, component two accounting for 7%, and the remaining three factors accounting for 6%, 5%, and 4% respectively. Total

variance explained was 47%. A scree plot was generated, which indicated the existence of one dominant factor, with five lesser factors identified, for a total of six factors.

The researcher then attempted to confirm the number of factors. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was done with six factors, to generate a structure matrix and a component correlation matrix. Factor pattern and factor structure coefficients were examined in order to determine the contribution of variables to each given factor. Survey items with values less than .4 were eliminated, and the process was repeated with five factors, then with four. Finally, four factors were presumed to remain, with 18 TASI items remaining. Results of the final analysis are shown in Tables 2,3,4,5, and 6, below.

Table 2

<i>Mean and Standard Deviations of TASI Items*</i>		
Survey Item #	Mean	SD
1	4.77	1.548
4	4.51	1.564
6	3.43	4.644
7	3.84	1.666
11	5.37	1.286
14	2.94	1.597
15	3.99	1.957
16	4.17	1.410.
17	5.37	1.518

19	4.49	1.540
21	3.36	1.399
23	4.82	1.318
26	4.28	1.450
27	3.95	1.704
28	3.65	1.670
30	4.15	1.866
32	5.35	1.565
33	4.89	1.387

*N= 577 for all items

Table 3

Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix

TASI Item #	Scale 1	Scale 2	Scale 3	Scale 4
1	.456	.255	-.111	.182
4	.628	.039	-.037	-.082
6	.651	.051	.023	-.102
7	.644	.114	-.025	-.038
11	-.043	.115	.068	.581
14	.700	-.092	-.001	-.213
15	.735	.045	.040	-.066
16	-.292	.239	-.016	.530
17	.067	.715	-.026	.152

19	.130	-.104	.866	-.048
21	-.253	.616	-.101	-.143
23	.238	.540	.040	.037
26	-.153	.081	.853	.084
27	.122	.748	.071	.113
28	.129	.775	-.040	.028
30	.094	.793	.069	-.130
32	.231	-.353	-.028	.783
33	.559	-.047	.020	.198

Principal Component Analysis Extraction Method with Varimax Rotation

Table 4

Rotated Factor Structure Matrix

TASI Item #	Scale 1	Scale 2	Scale 3	Scale 4
1	.582	.488	-.138	.193
4	.647	.342	-.054	-.078
6	.674	.361	.004	-.097
7	.699	.426	-.048	-.031
11	-.086	.059	.066	.584
14	.654	.239	-.011	-.212
15	.755	.395	.020	-.060
16	-.173	.116	-.023	.536
17	.414	.754	-.075	.174

19	.060	-.103	.890	-.046
21	.045	.496	-.138	-.126
23	.498	.653	-.002	.055
26	-.133	-.048	.852	.089
27	.482	.805	.018	.137
28	.504	.841	-.096	.053
30	.475	.830	.012	-.104
32	.066	-.216	-.005	.774
33	.538	.228	.012	.201

Principle Component Analysis Method of Extraction with Varimax Rotation

Table 5

Communalities

TASI Item #	Extraction
1	.441
4	.428
6	.467
7	.501
11	.363
14	.481
15	.577
16	.363
17	.595

19	.809
21	.326
23	.473
26	.751
27	.677
28	.723
30	.718
32	.698
33	.330

Table 6

Total Variance Explained

	Extraction Sum of Squared "Loadings"			Rotation
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
Scale 1	14.088	31.758	31.578	11.381
Scale 2	4.050	9.129	40.887	11.518
Scale 3	3.462	7.804	48.692	3.551
Scale 4	3.069	6.917	55.609	3.166

Reliability

Following the above-mentioned item deletions, Cronbach's alpha (Henson, 2001) was conducted on the four scales, as well as overall reliability of the TASI. Scale 1:

attitude toward academic freedom and job security, comprised of seven items, attained reliability coefficient alpha of .7884. Scale 2: attitude toward tenure in general, comprised of 6 items, attained reliability coefficient alpha of .8420. Scale 3: attitude toward stopping the tenure clock, comprised of only two items, attained reliability coefficient alpha of .7020. Scale 4: attitude toward post-tenure review, comprised of three items, attained reliability coefficient alpha of .4229. Overall reliability of the TASI was coefficient alpha .7915.

Variables

Independent variables remaining in the study were faculty tenure status, rank, full or part-time status, and administrative responsibility. Dependent variables remaining after the above-mentioned analysis were faculty attitudes toward the following: Scale 1, Academic freedom and job security, Scale 2, Tenure in general; Scale 3, Stop-the-tenure-clock provisions; and Scale 4, Post tenure review. A total of eighteen survey items remained after item deletions, with four scales, as listed above. See Table 7, below, for a summary of variables, research questions, and survey items.

Table 7

Variables, Research Questions, and Survey Items

Variable Name	Research Question	Item(s) on Survey
Independent Variables		
1. Faculty tenure status	Research Question #1 What are the relative	Questionnaire
2. Faculty full or part-time status	percentages of tenured or tenure-track	Questionnaire
3. Faculty administrative status	faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty,	Questionnaire
4. Faculty rank	faculty administrative status, and faculty by rank?	Questionnaire
Dependent Variables		
	Research Question 2: Do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, full or part-time status, tenure status, and administrative status?:	
Scale 1: Attitude toward academic freedom and job security.	a. attitude toward academic freedom and job security?	TASI items 1,4,6,7,14,15,33

Scale 2: Attitude toward tenure in general	b. attitude toward tenure in general?	TASI items 17,21,23,27,28,30
Scale 3: Attitude toward stopping the tenure clock.	c. attitude toward stop-the-tenure-clock provisions?	TASI items 19,26
Scale 4: Attitude toward post-tenure review.	d. attitude toward post-tenure review?	TASI items 11,26,32

Data Analysis

Data obtained were analyzed according to the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the relative percentages of tenured or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, faculty administrative status, and faculty by rank?

Nominal data gathered by the questionnaire included within the survey packet were analyzed and descriptive statistics were computed as follows. Frequency counts and percentages of total were computed for the following independent variables: institutional type, faculty tenure or clinical status, faculty rank, full or part time faculty status, administrative status, and length of time in academia. Additionally, mode was computed for institutional type, faculty tenure or clinical status, faculty rank, full or part time faculty status and administrative status. Mean and median were computed for length of time in academia. See Table (in Results section) for results.

Research Question 2: Do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, faculty tenure status, and faculty administrative status?

- a. (Scale 1) Attitude toward academic freedom and job security? (survey items 1,4,6,7,14,15,33);
- b. (Scale 2) attitude toward tenure in general? (survey items 17,21,23,27,28,30);
- c. (Scale 3) Attitude toward stop-the-tenure-clock provisions? (19,26); and
- d. (Scale 4) Attitude toward post-tenure review? (survey items 11,16,32).

The TASI yielded continuous data and the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation, were computed for all four scales listed above. In addition, a Pearson product

moment correlation was performed to determine the strength and direction of relationships between the several independent variables and scales (dependent variables).

To evaluate group differences on the dependent variables, descriptive discriminant analysis (DDA) was performed. During DDA, each of the independent variables, consisting of faculty tenure status, faculty administrative status, and faculty rank, was tested individually with the synthetic combined dependent variable (made up of Scales 1,2,3, and 4, above) according to the following: Firstly, Wilks lambda was computed upon the full model in order to determine whether statistically significant differences existed among the groups, on the dependent variables. Effect size, eigenvalues and canonical correlations were obtained and evaluated as a test of all functions together. If the full model was found to be statistically significant, standardized discriminant function coefficients were computed in order to determine the extent to which a particular variable was being used to contribute to the total variance. Structure coefficients were then computed in an attempt to discern the variable's contribution to the overall explained variance. Finally, unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means, or centroids, were computed in an attempt to determine where the group differences lay.

RESULTS

The following results are organized according to the research questions which they address:

Research Question 1: Regarding faculty in accredited occupational therapy professional programs within the United States, employed within the 2001-2002 academic year, what are the relative percentages of tenured or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and faculty by rank, as reported by subjects participating in this research? Table 3, below, reports upon the frequency, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the above-mentioned faculty groups

Table 8

Frequency, Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation of Independent Variables

	<i>n</i>	%	Missing	M	Mdn	Mode	SD
Faculty Year of Tenure Track	108	18.7	469	3.93	4	4	1.502
Faculty Years in Academia	492	85.3	85	11.27	9.25	4	7.634
Scale 1	577	100	0	4.05	4	3.86	1.088
Scale 2	577	100	0	4.47	4.5	4.83	1.036
Scale 3	577	100	0	4.38	4.5	4	1.310
Scale 4	577	100	0	4.96	5	4.67*	.9706

*Multiple modes exist. The smallest one is shown.

Range of all = 1-7

As shown in Table 8, among those responding to the survey, years spent in academia ranged from one to forty years, with a mean of 11.27 years, median of 9.25 and mode of 4 years. Regarding faculty year of tenure track, range was 7 years, with a mean of 3.93 years and median and mode of 4 years, respectively. Response rates and results for each group are shown in Table 9, below.

Table 9

<i>Demographic Questionnaire Response Data</i>				
	Valid Responses	% of Total	Valid %	Number Missing
Faculty Full or Part-Time Status	563	97.6	100	14
Full Time	496	86	88.1	----
Part Time	67	11.6	11.9	----
Faculty Tenure Status	551	95.5	100	26
Tenured	206	35.7	37.4	----
Tenure-track	100	17.3	18.1	----
Clinical	131	22.7	23.8	----
Non-tenure, Non-clinical	114	19.8	20.7	----
Faculty Admin. Status	563	97.6	100	14
No Admin. Duties	397	68.8	70.5	----
Some Admin. Duties	147	25.5	26.1	----
Fieldwork Coordinator	19	3.3	3.4	----

Faculty Rank	547	94.8	100	30
Instructor/Lecturer	98	17	17.9	----
Assistant Professor	250	43.3	45.7	----
Associate Professor	141	24.4	25.8	----
Professor	58	10.1	10.6	----
Institutional Type	547	94.8	100	30
Four Year Institution	518	89.8	94.7	----
Medical School	29	5	5.3	----
Institutional Status	470	81.5	100	107
Public	248	43	52.8	----
Private Non-Profit	163	28.2	34.7	----
Private For Profit	59	10.2	12.6	----

Research Question 2: Regarding faculty in accredited occupational therapy professional programs within the United States, employed within the 2001-2002 academic year, do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, tenure status, and administrative status?

- a. Attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection?
- b. Attitude toward tenure in general?
- c. Attitude toward "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions?
- d. Attitude toward post-tenure review?

Valid Responses

There were a total of 577 surveys which met all criteria and which had complete responses to survey items. The following results include all 577 responses. The TASI yielded continuous data and the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and variance were computed for all four scales listed above in Research Question 2 (See Table 3). In addition, a Pearson product moment correlation was performed to determine the strength and direction of relationships between the several independent variables and scales (dependent variables). Results of the correlation are shown in Table 10, below.

Descriptive discriminate analysis was performed, and yielded canonical correlations, beta weights, structure coefficients, and group centroids, which were examined to determine the amount of variable contribution to the total variance. Levels of significance were computed for all of the above.

Results

Measures of central tendency were computed for Scales 1,2,3, and 4, with the following results, as seen in Table 2 in the Method section. All four scales had a range of 6, since the TASI asked participants to indicate their level of agreement on a seven point Likert scale. For Scale 1 of the TASI, participants had the following scores: mean score of 4.0532, median of 4.0, mode of 3.86, and SD of 1.0828. For Scale 2, mean score was 4.4752, median was 4.5, and mode was 4.83; and SD was 1.0356. On Scale 3, participant mean score obtained was 4.3821, median was 4.3821, mode was 4.0, and SD was 1.3130. On Scale 4, the results were as follows: mean score of 4.9653, median of 5, and multiple modes were found, the smallest of which was 4.67; SD was .9706.

Correlation coefficients (r) were computed to determine the strength of the relationship between variables (See Table 10), and coefficients of determination (r^2) were computed and multiplied by 100 to determine the proportion of total variance held in common by the two variables. Scale One was found to be statistically significantly correlated with Scales Two and Four, respectively, at the .01 level. A moderate positive correlation ($r=.643$, $r^2=41\%$) was found between Scale One and Two, however the correlation between Scale One and Scale Four was low ($r=.109$, $r^2=.012$).

Table 10

Intercorrelations Between Variables

	Institutional Type	Scale 1	Scale 2	Scale 3
Scale 1	-.058			
Scale 2	-.017	.643**		
Scale 3	-.042	-.050	-.076	
Scale 4	-.017	-.109**	-.006	.024

** Correlation is statistically significant at the .01 level (2 tailed).

A matrix was created to determine whether sufficient numbers of participants were represented in all levels of the independent variables. The results showed that some categories were insufficient to yield a valid analysis. To remedy this, certain categories of data were aggregated, as follows. The category "part time" was removed from all analyses, as was the category for "other". In the variable administrator, the categories were reduced to "no administrative duty", and "some administrative duty", and the category for "academic fieldwork coordinator" was coded as missing.

Descriptive Discriminate Analysis (DDA)

To evaluate group differences on the dependent variables (Scales 1,2,3,4), and to determine where those differences might lie, descriptive discriminate analysis (DDA)

was performed. The analysis was accomplished on SPSS, and consisted of analyzing the combined effect of Scales 1,2,3, and 4 (synthetic dependent variable) with each of the three independent variables, in turn: faculty tenure status, faculty administrative status, and faculty rank. The results of that analysis are reported below and summarized in Table 11.

Faculty Tenure Status DDA

Following the recoding described above, there were 551 valid cases left for analysis of the independent variable, "faculty tenure status". These included 131 clinical faculty, 206 tenured faculty, 100 tenure-track faculty, and 114 non-tenure, non-clinical faculty. For faculty tenure status and Scales 1,2,3, and 4, the following results were found from the DDA: The full model showed group differences (Wilks lambda = .818), with a moderate effect size (.18), and was statistically significant at $p > .001$. Canonical correlations on the full model, in which all levels of the independent variable were combined, showed that Function 1 explained most of the variance (.404), with a moderate effect size (.16). Function 2 explained .144 of variance, with a small effect (.02). (See Table 11). The remaining function did not significantly contribute to the analysis, and will not be reported or explained.

Table 11

Faculty Tenure Status Canonical Correlations

Function	R_c	R_c^2
1	.404	.16
2	.144	.02

Standardized discriminant function coefficients showed that Scale 1, attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection, was the most-used variable within the total variance, with Scale 2 and Scale 4 contributing to a lesser degree. Scale 3 did not contribute significantly to the total variance. The structure coefficients for the Scale 1 and Scale 2 canonical variables demonstrated the greatest degree of explained variance, while Scale 3 and Scale 4 accounted for small amounts of the explained variance. Group centroids, unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means, showed that clinical faculty, tenured faculty, and non-tenure, non-clinical faculty held similar attitudes toward tenure, while tenure-track faculty attitudes differed. (See Table 12).

Table 12

Faculty Tenure Status Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients

	Function 1			Function 2		
	Stand.	Structure	r_s^2	Stand.	Structure	r_s^2
	Discr.	Coeffs.		Discr.	Coeffs.	
	Func.			Func.		
	Coeffs.			Coeffs.		
Scale 1	.630	.824	.68	.692	.398	.16
Scale 2	.427	.793	.63	.490	.114	.01
Scale 3	.071	.122	.01	.762	.748	.56
Scale 4	.432	.311	.10	.286	.345	.12

Faculty Administrative Status DDA

For the independent variable, faculty administrative status, 563 cases were analyzed. There were two levels, "some administrative duties", with 397 cases, and "no administrative duties", with 147 cases. When descriptive discriminate analysis was performed for faculty administrative status and combined Scales 1,2,3, and 4, no statistically significant group differences were found (Wilks lambda= .985). See Table 13 for canonical correlations.

Table 13

Faculty Administrative Status Canonical Correlations

Function	R_c	R_c^2
1	.118	.01
2	.113	.01

Faculty Rank DDA

For the independent variable, faculty rank, there were four levels, with the following number of cases each: instructor, 98 cases, assistant professor, 250 cases; associate professor, 141 cases; and professor, 58 cases. Descriptive discriminate analysis of faculty rank and combined Scales 1,2,3, and 4, the full model, showed group differences (Wilks lambda=.842), with a moderate effect size (16%), and was statistically significant at $p > .001$. When all levels of the independent variable were combined, canonical correlations showed that Function 1 explained most of the total variance (.372), with a moderate effect size (.14). Functions 2 and 3 accounted for very little of variance, and had small effect sizes. See Table 14 for specific values.

Table 14

Faculty Rank Canonical Correlations

Function	R_c	R_c^2
1	.372	.14
2	.141	.02

Standardized discriminant function coefficients showed that Scale 2, attitude toward tenure in general, was the most-used variable within the total variance, with Scale 4, attitude toward post-tenure review, contributing as well. Scales 1 and 3 did not contribute significantly to the total variance. Structure coefficients for the Scale 2 and Scale 4 canonical variables demonstrated the greatest degree of explained variance, with Scales 1 and 3 accounting for small amounts of variance. Unstandardized canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group means, showed that faculty with the rank of professor held much more favorable attitudes toward tenure than those with lower ranks. See Table 15, below.

Table 15

Faculty Rank Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients and Structure Coefficients

	Function 1			Function 2		
	Stand.	Structure	r_s^2	Stand.	Structure	r_s^2
	Discr.	Coeffs.		Discr.	Coeffs.	
	Func.			Func.		
	Coeffs.			Coeffs.		
Scale 1	.221	.597	.36	.379	.001	.00
Scale 2	.721	.831	.70	.424	.279	.08
Scale 3	.130	.172	.03	.741	.772	.60
Scale 4	.541	.457	.21	.556	.558	.31

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to examine the current attitudes of faculty in accredited occupational therapy academic programs toward tenure and alternatives to tenure. The literature reviewed seems to indicate that occupational therapy faculty differ from faculty in other areas of academia in several ways. They traditionally emphasize teaching over research, many have not earned a doctorate, and they maintain their own clinical competencies in order to ensure that students receive the most current treatment techniques and modalities possible. In many ways, faculty teaching in occupational therapy programs do not resemble faculty teaching in other areas of the academy.

Tenure has been a popular topic of discussion in the higher education literature and in public forums during the past few years. Some universities have abolished tenure, while others have created parallel career tracks involving long-term contracts rather than the guarantees of employment inherent in the tenure relationship. In addition, the use of adjunct and part-time faculty has increased. While any discussion of tenure usually involves the property right of the faculty member to continued employment, there is another significant element of tenure which must be considered. That is the issue of academic freedom, and whether it can be adequately protected outside of the existence of tenure. Arguments abound on both sides of the issue, and there is considerable

disagreement regarding whether existing laws serve to protect faculty's right to academic freedom within the classroom.

A review of higher education and occupational therapy literature on the subject of tenure has shown few studies on the topic of faculty attitudes toward tenure and alternatives to tenure. There was no appropriate instrument found with which these attitudes might be measured. Recent data collection efforts by HERI and AERA on the subject of tenure contained a few questions regarding faculty and administrator's opinions regarding the viability of the continuation of tenure, but did not seem to address faculty attitudes. None were particularly addressed toward occupational therapy academic faculty. Therefore, the study consisted of two parts, as follows: the first part an examination of face and content validity of scores obtained on the TASI, followed by an examination of the TASI scales' reliability; and, second, use of the TASI to collect data which would answer the researcher's questions of interest.

Creation of the TASI

In order that the TASI might reflect the issues concerning tenure currently under consideration by faculty, administrators, legislators, and other stakeholders, a review of current higher education and occupational therapy literature was accomplished. The major topics within the discussion seemed to be continuation of traditional tenure, protection of academic freedom and job security, post-tenure review, changing the duration of probationary periods, and long-term non-tenure track appointments. Additionally, use of part-time and adjunct faculty was discussed, with some researchers claiming that offering contracts in lieu of tenure would facilitate the development of a

dual labor market within academia. It seemed appropriate to address the historical development of higher education and of occupational therapy as an allied health discipline, since tenure as it exists currently is the product of an evolutionary process.

Following the literature review, the researcher formulated survey items which were intended to reflect positive and negative attitudes toward tenure and alternatives to tenure, and these 35 items formed the TASI. In addition, a questionnaire was developed to gather information from participants regarding faculty characteristics. A panel of higher education and occupational therapy faculty members reviewed the TASI items for construct validity, appropriateness, clarity, content, and organization. The following six constructs were included within the original form of the TASI: 1) continuation of traditional tenure, 2) academic freedom protection, 3) job security protection, 4) attitude toward changing the duration of probationary periods, 5) attitude toward long-term nontenure-track appointments, and 6) attitude toward post-tenure review. Thus, the researcher intended that the TASI would consist of six scales, each reflecting the participant's attitude toward that construct. The faculty panel recommended various changes be made to the TASI, as outlined in the Method section of this paper, and these were accomplished before the instrument was mailed out to recipients.

The questions originally guiding the research were as follows:

Research Question One: What are the relative percentages of tenured or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and faculty by rank, as reported by subjects participating in this research?

Research Question Two: What is the overall attitude of faculty toward tenure in its traditional form, as measured by the TASI, and based upon faculty rank, full or part-time status, tenure status, and length of time in academia?

Research Question Three: Do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, full or part-time status, tenure status, and length of time in academia?

- a. Attitude toward continuation of traditional tenure
- b. attitude toward academic freedom protection
- c. Attitude toward job security protection

Research Question Four: Do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, full or part-time status, tenure status, and length of time in academia?

- a. Attitude toward changing the duration of probationary periods, including "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions?
- b. Attitude toward long-term nontenure-track appointments, including salary incentives to faculty who agree to forego tenure?
- c. Attitude toward post-tenure review, including allowing termination of tenured faculty on the basis of performance criteria?

Following revision of the TASI, a survey packet was mailed out to persons identified by the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA) as occupational therapists or occupational therapy assistants whose primary work setting was education. The addresses on the list supplied by the AOTA were accurate, however 325 respondents wrote that they had never worked in any area of education and did not know how their names got on the list, and 112 worked in education, but did not meet other criteria of the

study. Thus, the population turned out to be smaller than the researcher had thought. These numbers only reflect those participants who chose to return some part of their survey packet to the researcher. It cannot be determined how many others who received a packet were wrongly identified.

The response rate attained was 49%, after the unusable surveys were eliminated. Many surveys were judged by the researcher to be invalid because they were incomplete or because the participant had marked through categories on the demographic questionnaire or added new categories. More than fifty respondents wrote subjective comments in the margin and on the back of the survey, even though no comments were asked for. The themes of these comments were as follows: strongly supportive of the research; critical of the research because, in the opinion of the respondent, it did not explore the "nuances of the subject of tenure"; identifying the respondent as a former student of the researcher; indicating that they did not know much about tenure; and identifying that the respondent was a doctoral student. These subjective comments were interesting and served to reinforce the researcher's view that a discussion of issues related to tenure among occupational therapy academic faculty could be facilitated easily. Many of the comments indicated eagerness on the part of the writer to enter into a dialogue with the researcher. The supportive comments were encouraging to the researcher, and more than made up for the relatively small number of negative ones.

Some respondents reacted harshly to the questions on the survey. In particular, items 13 (Tenure is an institution which must be preserved.) and item 22 (Probationary periods discriminate against women.) seemed to be controversial or inflammatory to

some of the participants. One person wrote above item 22, "How asinine! Grow up! You just lost me." It was the researcher's intent to formulate and state the items in such a way as to provoke a response, in an effort to elicit polar responses to the items. Judging from the negative comments, some items went beyond this, and provoked anger in the participants. Both these items were eliminated by the factor analysis and validity analyses, so their impact upon the results cannot be known. This poses a threat to the validity of the study since those people who were offended by the questions enough to discontinue answering the survey may possess attitudes toward tenure which are not reflected in these results, since they chose not to complete their surveys. The question is also raised as to how many non-respondents were people who discarded the surveys because they did not like the items.

The researcher had originally planned to mail survey packets out to participants on Monday, September 10, 2001, however a printing error was found in the TASI, causing the surveys to have to be reprinted with the correction. This delay resulted in the surveys being sent out the week after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, and this poses a potential historical threat to the validity of this study. Many faculty members surveyed were located in the geographical areas most affected by the attacks. It is difficult to speculate on the impact of these events upon survey return and faculty attitudes toward tenure, however, the researcher believes that there must be some effect. Reported rates of depression and other reactionary illnesses have increased since the attacks, particularly on college campuses, and these conditions may have affected the participants' attitudes toward tenure and willingness to participate in the study.

Analysis of the returned questionnaires and attitude surveys began with factor analysis to validate the items and scales of the TASI. The mailed version of the TASI consisted of six scales, however these were reduced to four by the iterative process of factor analysis. Similarly, the number of items was reduced from 35 to 18. As a result of the reduction in items, Scale 3 consists of only two items and Scale 4 consists of three. This serves to hinder the reliability of the TASI, and makes it difficult to generalize results obtained on Scales 3 and 4. Following the above-described factor analysis, the research questions were revised, as follows:

Research Question One: Regarding faculty in accredited occupational therapy professional programs within the United States, employed within the 2001-2002 academic year, what are the relative percentages of tenured or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and faculty by rank, as reported by subjects participating in this research?

Research Question Two: Regarding faculty in accredited occupational therapy professional programs within the United States, employed within the 2001-2002 academic year, do faculty attitudes differ on the following, based upon faculty rank, tenure status, and administrative status?

- a. Attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection? (Scale 1)
- b. Attitude toward tenure in general? (Scale 2)
- c. Attitude toward "stop-the-tenure-clock" provisions? (Scale 3)
- d. Attitude toward post-tenure review? (Scale 4)

Examination of the items, which constitute each scale, shows that they seem closely related. Scale 1 consists of those items, which are most reflective of traditional tenure, such as academic freedom and job security protection. The items in scale 1 account for a large percentage of the total variance of the scores obtained on the TASI, and reflect positive attitudes toward tenure. Items within Scale 2 reflect faculty attitudes toward the continuation of traditional tenure or toward tenure in general. All the items except one, item 23, are negatively worded. Scales 3 and 4 must be interpreted with care, due to the small number of valid items remaining in both scales, and the low reliability of Scale 4.

Some categories of the independent variables were aggregated in order to yield sufficient numbers for valid DDA analysis, thus some of the variance among the participants was lost. After reading the responses of participants, the researcher could formulate a comprehensive list of new categories for response which were not included on the questionnaire, which was mailed out with the survey. For example, the categories of responses on institutional type did not include a category for "medical school". Twenty-nine participants wrote this category in, but it cannot be known how many respondents left this item blank, since the appropriate category was not provided.

The questionnaire which was mailed with the TASI was intended to gather data to be used to categorize and characterize participants as to the type of institution in which they were employed and their faculty status in terms of rank, tenure status, and full or part-time status. Additionally, participants were asked whether they had any administrative duties and for how many years they had been employed in academia.

These questions did not yield nearly as clear a picture of the survey respondents as the researcher had hoped, due to the omissions of categories such as the ones mentioned above. A disadvantage of fixed-choice questionnaire items is that the researcher must be sure to provide all relevant choices to participants. When participants could not find a category, which applied to them, some wrote in the appropriate category, or some checked one of the categories given, but wrote a clarifying statement or phrase beside the category item. Others left blanks--either the whole questionnaire or selected parts of it. These incomplete responses are reported in the results as "missing". See Table 3.

For those who completed the questionnaire, most were full time faculty without any administrative duties, teaching in a public four-year institution; were tenured or on the tenure track; held a rank of assistant or associate professor; and had worked in academia an average of 11 years. While this describes most of the respondents, there were notable exceptions within some of the categories. For example, 20% of those who returned surveys reported that their position was non-tenured and non-clinical. That is, they did not fit into the traditional categories of faculty positions one would expect to find within academic programs. It would be interesting to know what their positions were called and to have some more information about their faculty roles and titles.

Current debate in higher education has centered upon the viability of the tenure system. There is a reported increase in hiring of part-time and adjunct faculty, however 97 percent of research universities and 99 percent of four-year public colleges still offer tenure (Chait & Trower, 1997). According to the U.S. Department of Education (1999), 41% of all faculty were part-time in 1995. In addition, only 19% of faculty were on the

tenure track. About one-third (37%) of participants in the current study were tenured faculty, and about 18% were on the tenure track. Parham (1985) reported that of the occupational therapy faculty responding to her study, about one in three were tenured. Previously, Robinson (1978) reported that 33.0% of allied health faculty were tenured, as opposed to 50% of faculty nationally. Holt (1991) reported that 35.5% of allied health faculty surveyed were tenured, whereas campuswide rates were 58.2% at the time of his study. He offers the explanation that many faculty within schools of allied health do not hold doctoral degrees and may emphasize teaching over research as a possible reason for the lower rate within allied health as compared to other departments. Parham and Zemke (1997) reported that one-third of full-time occupational therapy faculty were tenured in 1994. Therefore, it seems to be true that the tenure rate for allied health and occupational therapy faculty is holding steady at a rate of somewhere around one-third, if the results of the study currently being reported can be believed to be valid.

In answer to Research Question One, above, of faculty responding to the TASI, 23.3% were clinical faculty, and 20% of respondents reported their full-time faculty position was neither tenure-track nor clinical. Thus, about 43.5% were working under some type employment arrangement, which does not involve tenure. The American Faculty Poll, conducted in 1999, reported that the most common focus of efforts to change traditional tenure were increased hiring of part-time faculty and the institution of post-tenure review policies (Sanderson et al., 2000). Holt (1991) reported a variety of non-tenure track options for faculty employment, and found that 25% of the institutions represented in his survey offered renewable contracts to faculty. As Breneman (1997)

said, the faculty reward system is slowly changing, despite all the arguments about tenure. Trower (1996) reported that some fifteen percent of institutions in an AAHE study did not have a tenure system at all and 24% of them had policies for long-term faculty contracts. Thus, the results reported by the current study are consistent with previous findings. It is interesting to note that almost half the participants in the current study reported that they worked at private institutions and Chait and Trower (1997) found that 9% of all private colleges did not have a tenure system.

The greatest percentage (44.6%) of respondents in this survey held the rank of assistant professor. When this finding is contrasted with a mean of 11 years of employment in academia, and a median of 9.25 years, it would appear that the occupational therapy faculty surveyed are achieving promotion to the higher ranks quite slowly. Only 10% of faculty surveyed reported a rank of professor. It would seem that the recommendations of Ottenbacher and Stull (1992) that faculty should attain a minimum rank of associate professor before being granted tenure, are being followed. Parham (1985) reported that most faculty responding to her study held a rank of assistant professor. Half the Parham respondents had been employed in academia for less than five years.

About 70% of respondents said they had no administrative duties. This was an unexpected result, since most occupational therapy program administrators share in the teaching responsibilities of the department. About one-fourth of the participants said they had some administrative duties along with teaching, however, the researcher expected this number to be much larger. Interpretation of the results would be facilitated by

knowledge of the number of faculty and students within the programs. Since the programs were not identified by name, this was difficult to ascertain, except in cases where the respondent's institutional affiliation was known by the researcher.

An examination of responses to individual items on the TASI is interesting, when the results are compared with the literature. In a previous study reported by Sax et al., (1999), faculty agreed that tenure was an important factor in attracting quality faculty, however most respondents in the study being reported disagreed, as seen in their somewhat negative response to Item 7 of the TASI.

Many authors have reported upon the increased hiring of part-time faculty. Most respondents to the TASI (86%), however, were full-time faculty. This result may be related to the method of sampling used in the study. Participants were chosen according to their responses to the AOTA membership survey, which asked for identification of their "primary work setting". Part-time occupational therapy academic faculty may work primarily in other settings, possibly clinical ones, and may teach as adjuncts or part-time instructors.

The area of institutional type yielded some interesting results as well. The number and percentage of respondents who were employed by a public institution was about equal to the number who worked at private colleges or universities. This is an encouraging result, when compared to the AOTA "Listing of Educational Programs", which identified about half the academic programs as public and about half of them as private. This is an indication that characteristics of the respondents to the TASI seem to mirror the makeup of occupational therapy faculty as a whole in this respect.

Some respondents did not know whether their private institution was "for profit" or "non-profit". This is reflected in the 19% of responses within this category which were coded as "missing". When a response was not given, the researcher attempted to determine the status of the institution from other information included within the response, however it was not possible to do this in many cases, hence the large numbers of missing data.

While the mean length of time spent in academia was 11 years, about 75% of respondents had been in academia for 15 years or less at the time of the survey. Some 10% of respondents said they had worked in academia for 23 years or more. The greatest amount of experience was reported as 40 years by a woman who described herself as a "professor emerita". An interesting comparison to be made in future research would be to compare the responses of participants with various levels of experience in academia to see how their attitudes differ.

Research Question Two, above, sought to discover whether faculty tenure status, faculty administrative status, or faculty rank were statistically significant predictors of faculty attitudes toward tenure and alternatives to tenure. Analysis of the TASI showed that Scales 1 and 2 had the highest level of validity and reliability, and that they were also positively correlated to a moderate degree. Thus, Scales 1 and 2 appear to be closely related. Further analysis showed that Scale 1 accounted for the greatest portion of the variance in the TASI scores, followed by Scale 2. Scales 3 and 4 contributed only minimally to the total variance.

Faculty Tenure Status and Attitude Toward Tenure

Faculty attitude toward academic freedom and job security protection, as measured by Scale 1 of the TASI, and faculty attitude toward tenure in general, as measured by Scale 2, were strongly influenced by faculty tenure status. When grouped by tenure status, faculty differed to a moderate degree on the composite dependent variables, made up primarily of Scales 1 and 2, but also including Scales 3 and 4. Scale 1 was the main dependent variable explaining the difference, with Scale 2 next. Scales 3 and 4 were not very useful, because they accounted for so little of the variance. When a synthetic variable was created of the combined means of all the scales (dependent variables), primarily scales 1 and 2, the groups differed on their attitudes according to their tenure status. Tenure-track faculty held a more negative attitude toward academic freedom and job protection (Scale 1) and tenure in general (Scale 2). Tenured faculty, clinical faculty, and non-tenure, non-clinical faculty were, similarly, more positive in their attitudes toward the aspects of tenure measured by scales 1 and 2.

Faculty Rank and Attitude Toward Tenure

Faculty rank was a good predictor of attitudes toward tenure, particularly as measured by Scale 2 of the TASI. Analysis showed that faculty rank was positively correlated to Scale 2 of the TASI to a moderate degree. This relationship was reflected in the discriminate analysis as well. Scale 4 contributed the next most to the total variance, however Scales 1 and 3 were not significant contributors.

When a synthetic variable was created from the combined dependent variables, the groups showed statistically significant differences according to rank. Those faculty

members with a rank of professor had the most positive attitudes toward academic freedom and job protection and toward post-tenure review. Associate professors had a positive attitude to these, as well. However, assistant professors and instructors tended to have a more negative attitude toward the aspects of tenure measured by Scales 2 and 4 of the TASI.

Faculty Administrative Status and Attitude Toward Tenure

Faculty administrative status was not a statistically significant predictor of faculty attitudes toward tenure and alternatives toward tenure. The groups did not differ on the dependent variables; therefore no further inferences can be made regarding faculty attitudes toward tenure, based upon administrative status. The results of this study are consistent with those reported by Johnson (1991), in that faculty rank and faculty tenure status were the only significant factors in determining faculty attitudes toward tenure.

Regarding alternatives to tenure, sixteen percent of institutions in an AAHE study reported the existence of provisions to allow tenure-track faculty to "stop the tenure clock" (Trower, 1996). Interestingly enough, the AAUP official tenure policy opposes any provision which lengthens the probationary period of faculty for any reason. This seems particularly relevant to occupational therapy faculty, given that there is a high percentage of women teaching in academic programs, and women are the ones most likely to need to postpone career goals in order to attend to child-rearing or other family considerations (Trower, 1996). It was the intent of the researcher to measure occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward such alternatives to tenure as stopping the tenure clock and post-tenure review. Suess (1995) reported that nursing faculty held positive attitudes

toward post-tenure review. Respondents to the TASI also responded favorably toward this construct, as measured by Scale 4, however the results should be interpreted with care, due to the low level of reliability of that scale of the TASI. Unfortunately, the results obtained show that this study cannot reliably measure occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward alternatives to tenure. A revision of the TASI and the addition of items to Scales 3 and 4 are needed in order to increase confidence in the scores obtained.

In conclusion, this study has contributed to an increased understanding of occupational therapy academic faculty in three major ways: 1) the development of the TASI; 2) a description of current faculty characteristics; and 3) the knowledge that faculty support the continuation of traditional tenure. The TASI has been shown to have some degree of face and content validity. Construct validity remains unproven, as does the reliability of scores obtained through use of the TASI with which to measure faculty attitudes toward tenure. Further revision and refinement of the instrument may result in greater utility by occupational therapy program administrators for the purpose of validating existing or proposed faculty reward systems. Attitudes of faculty within a given academic program may be compared to the results of this study to determine whether there are similarities or differences with occupational therapy faculty as a whole.

Since a representative sample of occupational therapy academic faculty was achieved, information regarding faculty characteristics gained through this study has produced a “snapshot” of occupational therapy faculty as it existed during fall semester of 2001. These data may be used by the American Occupational Therapy Association to facilitate planning and programming for faculty and administrators.

Finally, the knowledge that occupational therapy academic faculty as a whole support the continuation of traditional tenure and the protection of academic freedom and job security may assist university administrators in planning effectively for the future. Given the recent decrease in enrollment, faculty and administrators within schools of occupational therapy are being called upon to justify productivity levels as well as to implement cost-effective programs. The TASI might be used to determine the level of faculty support for continuation of tenure within a given school of occupational therapy.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the characteristics of occupational therapy academic faculty which distinguish them from the rest of the academy have an effect upon their attitudes toward tenure. An unspoken hypothesis was that they would be as different from other faculty in their attitudes toward tenure as they are in regards to other characteristics such as research productivity and earned doctorates. The results of the study did not confirm that hypothesis. In fact, it would seem that the same factors, such as faculty tenure status and faculty rank, which have been traditionally associated with positive attitudes toward tenure among faculty in other programs, are the same factors which predict positive attitudes in occupational therapy faculty. Occupational therapy academic faculty may differ from traditional faculty in many ways, but they hold similar attitudes toward tenure, based upon tenure status and rank, as measured by the instrument used in this study.

The higher education literature contains many references to the culture of academia, and how that is related to faculty reward systems such as tenure. Possibly, the influence of norms and standards of the academy upon faculty attitudes toward tenure

outweighs faculty member's professional identities as occupational therapists.

Occupational therapy academic faculty may have adopted the views of their colleagues, despite their apparent differences in other areas. Future research on occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward tenure might include the use of qualitative methods to further explore the nuances of faculty attitudes which were not addressed by an objective instrument, such as the TASI.

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER FOR PARTICIPANTS

July 11, 2001

Dear Colleague,

You have received this letter because I understand that you spend some part of your time in an academic setting teaching occupational therapy students. If you are not employed in an academic setting, please indicate that on the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the envelope provided. This will ensure that you do not receive any followup reminders during the rest of this study.

I teach in an occupational therapy academic program, and am conducting research on occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward tenure for my doctoral dissertation. The enclosed questionnaire and survey will answer questions of interest regarding your tenure status, your years of experience in an academic setting, and your attitudes toward tenure and some alternatives to tenure which others have proposed. I believe it will take about 20 minutes of your time to complete the materials and return them to me. This project has been reviewed by the University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (940/565-3940). Returning the completed survey indicates that you have consented to participate in this study. Should you need to contact me, I can be reached at the address listed above, or the numbers listed below. My faculty advisor's name and contact information is also listed below.

You will notice that your survey has an identification number at the top left of the page. This enables me to track response rate and to send follow-up reminders as needed. As soon as your survey is returned, your name will be deleted from the tracking list, and your responses will only be listed according to the identification number. None of the data analysis or reports will contain any identifying information about you or your institution. Your responses will be included in the total data set for analysis. Thus, your responses will remain anonymous and will be destroyed after data analysis is completed.

I hope that you will take the time to complete and return the questionnaire and survey in the envelope provided within the next two weeks. Be sure to let me know if you are interested in having a summary of the final results. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Diane P. Brown, MOT, OTR
Phone 940-898-2812
e-mail dbrown@twu.edu
Faculty Advisor Ron Newsom, PhD
Program in Higher Education
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 311337
Denton, TX 76203-1337

APPENDIX B
REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE

ID # _____

Please mark an X next to the characteristics which describe you and your present job.

_____ I am not currently employed in an academic setting. (If this is the case, please return this sheet to the researcher in the enclosed envelope so you will not receive any followup reminders.)

Faculty Position (Please check all that apply.)

- _____ Full-time clinical faculty
_____ Full-time tenured faculty
_____ Full time tenure-track faculty in year ____ (*please specify*)
_____ Some administrative duties in addition to teaching at least 1 course
_____ Administrator only (no teaching responsibilities within an academic year)
_____ Part-time clinical faculty
_____ Other, please describe _____

Faculty Rank

- _____ Instructor
_____ Assistant Professor
_____ Associate Professor
_____ Professor
_____ Other, please name _____

Institutional Work Setting (Check all that apply)

- _____ 4 Year Institution
_____ 2 Year Institution
_____ Public Institution
_____ Private non-profit Institution
_____ Private for-profit Institution

_____ Total years of employment in an academic setting.

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this survey, please enter the following information:
e-mail _____

Please return this sheet and the completed Tenure Attitude Scale in the enclosed envelope.

Definitions of Terms

Academic freedom- Freedom of faculty to "inquire, discover, publish, and teach the truth... without any control or authority of the rational methods by which truth is established" (Kirk, 1955).

Clinical faculty- A faculty member whose primary responsibility is teaching, and who is not eligible for tenure.

Post-tenure review- a process of performance evaluation which occurs after a faculty member has achieved tenured status.

Probationary period- The period of time, usually six years, during which a tenure-track faculty member is expected to show evidence of the ability to perform research, teaching, and service.

"Stop the tenure clock" - Provisions in tenure policy which defer the deadline for seeking tenure under certain circumstances.

Tenure- A property right of faculty which is obtained through a specified review process.

APPENDIX C
REVISED TASI INSTRUMENT

Tenure Attitude Scale

Circle the number to the right of each statement which reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

1= strongly disagree

2= disagree

3= somewhat disagree

4=neutral or no opinion

5= somewhat agree

6= agree

7= strongly agree

1.	Tenure protects academic freedom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Tenured faculty should be held accountable for their performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Tenure rewards faculty who are good teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Without tenure, faculty are subject to the whims of the administration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Good clinicians do not need tenure-track appointments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Faculty need to stick together and refuse any contract which does not include tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Without tenure, it would be hard to attract qualified personnel to academia.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	The laws are not adequate to protect academic freedom; we need tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	The length of probationary periods should be negotiable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Increasing salaries in lieu of tenure is just another way to undermine the tenure system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Post-tenure review is discriminatory.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Tenure rewards faculty who engage in research.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Tenure is an academic institution which must be preserved.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Faculty without tenure cannot speak freely within the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	My job would be less secure without tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Post-tenure review procedures may be used to remove unpopular faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Tenure has no place within occupational therapy academic programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Academic freedom is worth protecting at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Faculty should have the right to "stop the tenure clock" in order to allow more time to meet tenure requirements.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Tenure rewards faculty who engage in service to their profession and community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	It is easy to see why people outside academia oppose tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	Probationary periods discriminate against women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	Tenure should be supported by administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	Our professional schools need tenure in order to be effective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	Tenure is necessary in order to insure continued employment for faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Stopping the tenure clock just delays the inevitable-six years is long enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	Forget tenure--I prefer a higher rate of pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	It is difficult to justify the existence of tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	It is nearly impossible to fire tenured faculty, even when they are incompetent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	Competent faculty members have no need for tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	Tenure-track is for those who cannot teach clinical competencies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	Tenured faculty who do their jobs have nothing to fear from post-tenure review.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	Tenure allows faculty to support measures which are unpopular with administration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD TEXT

Dear Colleague,

A few weeks ago you received a questionnaire and survey from me asking for your participation in a study about OT faculty attitudes toward tenure. I have not yet received your response. While I understand that your time is valuable, let me encourage you to complete and return the survey materials so that I can include your responses with the others I have received. If you need another copy, you may request one by e-mail at dbrown@twu.edu or by phoning 940-898-2812.

Thanks,

Diane Brown, MOT, OTR

APPENDIX E
ORIGINAL VERSION OF TASI

Tenure Attitude Survey

Circle the number to the right of each statement which reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement. 1= strongly disagree; 2= somewhat disagree; 3=disagree; 4=neutral or no opinion; 5=agree; 6=somewhat agree; 7= strongly agree.

1.	Tenure protects academic freedom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Tenured faculty should be held accountable for their performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Tenure rewards faculty who are good teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Without tenure, faculty are subject to the whims of the administration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Good clinicians do not need tenure-track appointments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Faculty need to stick together and refuse any contract which does not include tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Without tenure, it would be hard to attract qualified personnel to academia.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	The laws are not adequate to protect academic freedom; we need tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	The length of probationary periods should be negotiable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Increasing salaries in lieu of tenure is just another way to undermine the tenure system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Post-tenure review is discriminatory.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Tenure rewards faculty who engage in research.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Tenure is an academic institution which must be preserved.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Faculty without tenure cannot speak freely within the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	My job would be less secure without tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Administrators will use post-tenure review to get rid of unpopular faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Tenure has no place within occupational therapy academic programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Academic freedom is worth protecting at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Faculty should have the right to "stop the tenure clock" in order to allow more time to meet tenure requirements.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Tenure rewards faculty who engage in service to their profession and community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	It is easy to see why people outside academia oppose tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	Probationary periods discriminate against women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	Tenure should be supported by administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	Our professional schools need tenure in order to be effective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	Tenure is necessary in order to insure continued employment for faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Stopping the tenure clock just delays the inevitable-six years is long enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	Forget tenure--I prefer a higher rate of pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	It is difficult to justify the existence of tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	Market forces have no place in academia.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	It is nearly impossible to fire tenured faculty, even when they are incompetent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	Competent faculty members have no need for tenure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	University finances are not a faculty problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	Tenure-track is for those who cannot teach clinical competencies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	Tenured faculty who do their jobs have nothing to fear from post-tenure review.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35.	Tenure allows faculty to support measures which are unpopular with administration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX F

SCORE SHEET FOR GUIDED SORT

Score Sheet for Guided Sort

Participant's Name _____

Date _____

1. Changing Duration of Probationary Periods
2. Job Security Protection
3. Academic Freedom Protection
4. Post-Tenure Review
5. Continuation of Traditional Tenure
6. Long-term Non Tenure-track appointments

APPENDIX G
COVER LETTER FOR FACULTY PANEL

2316 Evergreen Street
Carrollton, TX 75006

July 10, 2001

Dear Colleague,

I am conducting research on occupational therapy faculty attitudes toward tenure for my doctoral dissertation. After reviewing the literature, I was unable to find a suitable instrument to use in the study, and so have created an original one called The Tenure Attitude Scale. I am seeking your help in gaining a preliminary understanding of the level of face validity and content validity of the instrument. I estimate that it will take about one hour of your time to review the instrument, comment, and return it to me. Revisions will be made to the instrument based upon the feedback given by yourself and other faculty members in occupational therapy, higher education, and testing and measurement.

If you agree to act as an expert reviewer, please complete the enclosed forms and return them to me in the enclosed envelope by August 10. If you need further information, you may reach me at the address given above, or the numbers listed below. This project has been reviewed by the UNT committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, who can be contacted at 940-565-3940. Should you need to contact him, my faculty advisor's name and contact information is also included below. If you are interesting in having a summary of the final results of this project, please indicate that on the enclosed form, and a copy will be sent to you by e-mail.

Thank you in advance for your help, and I look forward to receiving feedback from you.

Sincerely,

Diane P. Brown MOT, OTR
w. 940-898-2812
h. 972-242-6555
fax 972-898-2806
e-mail dbrown@twu.edu

Faculty Advisor
Ron Newsom, PhD
Program in Higher Education
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 311337
Denton, TX 76203-1337
940-565-2722

APPENDIX H

FEEDBACK FORM FOR FACULTY PANEL

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to critique the Tenure Attitude Scale. Please provide feedback on the following aspects, or any other which occur to you:

1. Readability

2. Clarity

3. Content

4. Length

5. Additional general comments and suggestions

You may give feedback on this form, or on another sheet if you desire. Thanks again for your help.

Diane Brown

_____ I would like a summary of the final project when it is completed.

e-mail address _____

REFERENCE LIST

- Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Akins, D. (1997). The economics of tenure: Understanding the effects of ethnicity, status and discipline on faculty attitude, workload and productivity. (Doctoral Dissertation: University of Southern California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, 05A, 1477.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (1999). Facing change: Building the faculty of the future. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (1990). The 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. In Policy Documents & Reports. ("The AAUP Red Book"). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Medical Association. (2000). Health professions career and education directory, 28th edition. American Medical Association.
- American Occupational Therapy Association. (2000). Listing of educational programs. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 54(6), 649-660.
- Angstadt, C. N., Nieman, L. Z., & Morahan, P. S. (1998). Strategies to expand the definition of scholarship for the health professions. Journal of Allied Health, 27, 157-161.
- Arreola, R. A. (1998). Issues in developing a faculty evaluation system. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 56-63.
- Baez, B., & Centra, J. A. (1995). Tenure, promotion, and reappointment: Legal and administrative implications. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 608).
- Barton, G. E. (1915). Occupational therapy. Trained Nurse and Hospital Review, 54, 138-140.
- Benjamin, E. (1995). Five misconceptions about tenure. Trusteeship, 3, 16-21.

- Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, N. J. : Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brayley, C. R. (1996). From clinician to academician: A handbook for those who aspire to become faculty members. Bethesda, MD: American Occupational Therapy Association.
- Breneman, D. W. (1997). Alternatives for tenure for the next generation of academics. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series. Inquiry #14. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 824).
- Brown, P. Q. (1999). Salaried and tenure of full-time instructional faculty on 9- and 10-month contracts. (Report No. NCES-1999-193). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 947).
- Brown, R., & Kurland, J. (1993). Academic tenure and academic freedom. In Freedom and tenure in the academy, ed. By W. W. Van Alstyne. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Byrne, P. J. (1997). Academic freedom without tenure. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #5. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 816).
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends, 1989. Princeton, N. J.: Author.
- Case-Smith, J. (1999). Developing a research career: Advice from occupational therapy researchers. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 44-50.
- Chabotar, K. J., & Honan, J. P. (1996). New yardsticks to measure financial distress. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #4. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 815).

- Chait, R. (1998). Ideas in incubation: Three possible modifications to traditional tenure policies. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series. Inquiry #9. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 819).
- Chait, R. P., & Ford, A. T. (1982). Beyond traditional tenure: A guide to sound policies and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chait, R., & Trower, C. A. (1997). Where tenure does not reign: Colleges with contract systems. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #3. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 814).
- Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). Women in academe: Progress and prospects. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Christiansen, C. H. (1981). Editorial--Toward resolution of crisis: Research requisites in occupational therapy. Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 1, 115-124.
- Christiansen, C. H. (1991). Nationally speaking--Research: Looking back and ahead after four decades of progress. American Journal of Occupational therapy, 45, 391-396.
- Chronister, J. L., Baldwin, R. G., & Conley, V. M. (Eds.). (1997). 1993 national study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF-93): Retirement and other departure plans of instructional faculty and staff in higher education institutions, NCES 98-XXX, Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (1973). Faculty tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conine, T. A., Schilling, L. M., & Pierce, E. R. (1985). The relative importance of supportive data for promotion and tenure reviews. Journal of Allied Health, 14, 183-190.
- Connors, J. V. (1990). Gender differences in perceived advancement problems, stress, interpersonal stress, and satisfaction of university faculty. (Doctoral Dissertation: University of Missouri - Columbia). Dissertation Abstracts International 51, 08A, 0133.
- Cooper, C. G. (1983). Title VII in the academy: Barriers to equality for faculty women. UC Davis Law Review, 16, 975-1022.

- Crepeau, E. B., Thibodaux, L., & Parham, D. (1999). Academic juggling act: Beginning and sustaining an academic career. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 25-30.
- Crist, P. (1993a, March 1). From clinic to classroom: So you want to be an educator? OT Advance, 4.
- Crist, P. (1993b, March 8). From clinic to classroom: Know the 3 Rs of academia. OT Advance, 6.
- Crist, P. (1993c, March 15). From clinic to classroom: On the job in academia. OT Advance, 6.
- Crist, P. (1993d, March 29). From clinic to classroom: Tenure, rank make academia unique? OT Advance, 5.
- Crist, P. (1993e, April 15). From clinic to classroom: How to apply for a faculty job. OT Advance, 7.
- Crist, P. (1993f, April 19). From clinic to classroom: The fine points of interviewing. OT Advance, 4.
- Crist, P. (1993g, April 26). From clinic to classroom: So you want to be an educator? OT Advance, 5.
- Crist, P. (1999). Career transition from clinician to academician: Responsibilities and reflections. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 14-19.
- Davis, D. E., & Astin, H. S. (1990) Life cycle, career patterns, and gender stratification in academe. In Lie, S. S., & O'Leary, V. (Eds.), Storming the tower: Women in the academic world (pp. 89-107). East Brunswick, NJ: Nichols/GP.
- Diamond, R. M. (1993). How to change the faculty reward system. Trusteeship 1(5), 17-21.
- Dillman, D. A., Christenson, J. A., Salant, P. & Warner, P. D. (November, 1995). What the public wants from higher education: Workforce implications from a 1995 national survey. (Tech. Rep. No 95-52). Pullman, WA: Social and Economic Sciences Research Center, Washington State University.
- Dunton, W. R. (1919). Reconstruction therapy. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Edgerton, R. (1993). Re-examination of faculty priorities. Change, 25(4), 10-25.
- Elder, O. C., & Nick, T. G. (1995). Desired competencies of doctorally prepared allied health faculty. Journal of Allied Health, 109-116.

- Epps, E. G. (1989). Academic culture and the minority professor. Academe, 75, 23-26.
- Finkel, S. K., & Olswang, S. G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. The Review of Higher Education, 19, 123-139.
- Finkin, Matthew W., ed. (1996). The Case for Tenure. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Fisher, G. S. (1999). The status of occupational therapy education in the 90's. Occupational Therapy in Health Care, 12, 1-15.
- Flanigan, K. S., Ballinger, P. W., Grant, H. K., Schiller, M. R., & Waller, K. B. (1988). Research productivity profile of allied health faculty. Journal of Allied Health, 17, 87-100.
- Gappa, J. M. (1996). Off the tenure track: Six models for full-time nontenurable appointments. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #10. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 820).
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1997). Two faculties or one ? The conundrum of part-timers in a bifurcated work force. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #6. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 817).
- Gappa, J. M., & MacDermid, S. M. (1997). Work, family, and the faculty career. New Pathways: Inquiry #8. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 818).
- Gillette, N. P. (1982). A database for occupational therapy: Documentation through research. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36, 499-501.
- Habecker, E. B. (1981). A systematic approach to the study of benefits and detriments of tenure in American higher education: An analysis of the evidence. New York: State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 208).
- Hensel, N. (1991). Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2).

- Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34, 177-189.
- Henson, R. K. & Roberts, J. K. (in press). Exploratory factor analysis reporting practices in published research. In B. Thompson (Ed.), Advances in social science methodology (Vol. 6). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Heydinger, R. B., & Simsek, H. (1992). An agenda for reshaping faculty productivity. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States.
- Hiller, M. D., & Ritvo, R. A. (1991). Commentary. Journal of Allied Health, 20, 85-93.
- Holcomb, J. D., & Rousch, R. E. (1988). A study of scholarly activities of allied health faculty in southern academic health science centers. Journal of Allied Health, 17, 277-293.
- Holt, T. B. O. (1991). A study of tenure among allied health faculty. Journal of Allied Health, 20, 245-253.
- Hook, S. (1971). In defense of academic freedom. New York: Pegasus.
- Hopkins, H. L. (1983). An historical perspective on occupational therapy. In Hopkins, H. L., and Smith, H. D. (Eds.). Willard and Spackman's occupational therapy 6th ed., pp. 3-23). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Howard, S. (1978) But we will persist: A comparative research report on the status of women in academe. Washington DC: American Association of University Women.
- Johnson, A. B. (1981). The problems of contraction: Legal considerations in university retrenchment. Journal of College and University Law, 10(3), 269-324.
- Johnson, K. M. (1991). Attitudes of faculty members at Florida's community colleges regarding tenure/continuing contract. (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, (03A), 0787.
- Katz, D. A. (1973). Faculty salary, promotion, and productivity at a large university. American Educational Review, 63, 469-477.
- Keast, W. R. (1973). Faculty tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keith, K. M. (1997). Faculty attitudes toward tenure and academic freedom at private universities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational

- Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 812).
- Kelley, L. K., and Baker, J. M. (1980). Women in nursing and academic tenure. Journal of Nursing Education, 19, 41-48.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 386-387.
- Kirk, R. (1955). Academic freedom: An essay in definition. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company.
- Kraemer, L. G., & Lyons, K. J. (1989). Research productivity of allied health faculty in academic health centers. Journal of Allied Health, 18, 349-359.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.
- Leap, T. L. (1993). Tenure, Discrimination, and the Courts. Ithaca, N. Y.: ILR Press.
- Leed, A. H. (1997). Academic freedom issues in higher education: Tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410 781).
- Lewis, D. R., & Becker, W. E. (Eds.). (1979). Academic rewards in higher education. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. E. (1997). Post-tenure review: Policies, practices, precautions. New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #12. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 822).
- Llorens, L. A. & Gillette, N. P. (1985). Nationally Speaking--Challenge for research in a practice profession. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39, 143-146.
- Lucas, C. (1994). American higher education: A history. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Luz Reyes, M., & Halcon, J. J. (1988). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 299-314.
- Magner, D. K. (1996, September 13). Fewer professors believe western culture should be the cornerstone of the college curriculum. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A12-A15.

- Maitland, C. (1990). The inequitable treatment of women faculty in higher education. In Welch, L. B. (Ed.). Women in higher education: Changes and challenges (pp. 245-254). New York: Praeger.
- McCart, C. (1991). Using a cultural lens to explore faculty perceptions of academic freedom. (Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1991).
- McPherson, M. S., & Winston, G. C. (1983). The economics of academic tenure. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 4, 163-184.
- Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 123-144.
- Mettler, P., & Bork, C. E. (1985). Tenure and the allied health professions: Issues and alternatives. Journal of Allied Health, 14, 119-127.
- Metzger, W. (1979). The history of tenure. Current Issues in Higher Education, 6, 1-17.
- Michels, E. (1989). Commentary: enhancing the scholarly base: The role of faculty in enhancing scholarship. Journal of Allied Health, 18, 129-142.
- Minimum standards for courses of training in occupational therapy. (1924). Archives of Occupational Therapy, 3(4), 295-298.
- Montagna, P. (1977). Theories of labor market stratification. In Occupations and society: Toward a sociology of the labor market. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- National Commission on Higher Education Issues. (1982). To strengthen quality in higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Nelson, D. L. (1997). Why the profession of occupational therapy will flourish in the 21st century, 1996 Eleanor Clarke Slagle lecture. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 51, 11-24.
- Nolinske, T. (1999). Preparing and developing faculty through faculty development initiatives. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 9-13.
- Nuchims, P. (1995). Will tenure end with this century? A pastiche of quotes and ideas leading to a challenge. Academe, 40-42.
- Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, National Research Council. (1996). Summary Report 1995: Doctorate Recipients From United States Universities. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Olswang, S. G. (1982). Planning the unthinkable: Issues in institutional reorganization and faculty reductions. Journal of College and University Law, 9(4), 431-449.

- Olswang, S. G. (1992, February). Economic crisis: Reduction in force. Paper presented at the Thirteenth Annual National Conference on Law and Higher Education, Clearwater Beach, Florida.
- Olswang, S. G. & Lee, B. A. (1984). Faculty freedoms and institutional accountability: Interactions and conflicts. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. ED 252 170.
- O'Toole, J. A. (1978). Tenure: A conscientious objection. Change, 10(6), 24-31.
- O'Toole, J. A. (1979). A poverty of historicism: A critique of Walter Metzger's defense of tenure. Current Issues in Higher Education, 6, 13-14.
- Ottenbacher, K. J., & Stull, G. A. (1992). Rethinking the promotion and tenure process: A response to Hiller and Ritvo. Journal of Allied Health, 21, 1-5.
- Parham, D. (1985). The academic reward structure and occupational therapy faculty. Part I: Characteristics of faculty. Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 5, 83-100.
- Parham, D., and Zemke, R. (1997). Research activities survey of professional programs. The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 51, 622-626.
- Perley, J. E. (1995). Problems in the academy: Tenure, academic freedom, and governance. Academe, January-February, 43-47.
- Pew Health Professions Commission. (1995). Critical challenges: Revitalizing the health professions for the twenty-first century. San Francisco, CA: UCSF Center for the Health Professions.
- Poch, R. K. (1993). Academic freedom in American higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education (Report No. 4). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Premeaux, S. R. & Mondy, R. W. (1996). Tenure: Administrative versus faculty perspectives. CUPA Journal, 47, 25-31.
- Reed, K. L. (1993). The beginnings of occupational therapy. In Hopkins, H. L. and Smith, H. D., eds. (pp. 26-43). Willard and Spackman's Occupational Therapy, 8th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.
- Richardson, J. T. (1999). Tenure in the new millenium. National Forum, 79, 19-23.
- Robinson, T. C. (1978). A study of promotion and tenure in schools of allied health. Journal of Allied Health, 7, 49-56.

- Rogers, N. E. M. (1995). Mexican-American women in academe: Analysis of career progress and job satisfaction. (Doctoral Dissertation: University of Texas at Austin), Dissertation Abstracts International, 57, (01A), 0131.
- Sakamoto, A., & Chen, M. D. (1991). Inequality and attainment in a dual labor market. American Sociological Review, 56, 295-308.
- Sanderson, A., Phua, V. C., & Herda, D. (2000). The American faculty poll. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W. Korn, W. S. & Gilmartin, S. K. (1999). The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-1999 HERI faculty survey. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Schiller, M. R. (1985). Surveying research interests of allied health professionals, in Schiller, M. R., Beckley, P. D., Brunner, M. L., (Eds.). Collaborative Research in Allied Health. Columbus, Ohio: School of Allied Medical Professions. The Ohio State University.
- Schmitt, R. (1972). Academic freedom: The future of a confusion. In Pincoffs, E. (Ed.). The concept of academic freedom. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Slagle, E. C. (1938). Occupational therapy. Trained Nurse and Hospital Review, 100, 375-382.
- Slaughter, S. (1981/1987). Academic freedom in the modern university. In Altbach, P., & Berdahl, R. (Eds.), Higher education in American society, 2nd edition. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Suess, L. R. (1995). Attitudes of nurse-faculty toward post-tenure performance evaluation. Journal of Nursing Education, 34, 25-30.
- Tang, T. L., & Chamberlain, M. (1993). Perceptual differences between administrators and faculty members on teaching and research (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 082).
- Thompson, B., & Daniel, L. G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56, 197-208.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). Rethinking promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe. New York: SUNY Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report

- No. 6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 322).
- Tomes, N. (1964). *A generous confidence: Thomas Story Kirkbride and the art of asylum-keeping, 1840-1883*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Trower, C. A. (1996). Tenure snapshot. *New Pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #2*. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 813).
- Trower, C. A. (1999). The trouble with tenure. National Forum, 79, 24-29.
- Tuckman, H. P. (1976). *Publication, teaching, and the academic reward structure*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). Fall staff in postsecondary institutions, 1997. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Van Alstyne, W. (1971). Tenure: A summary, explanation, and 'defense'. AAUP Bulletin, 57, 328-333.
- West, W. (1949). Nationally Speaking--From the present. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 3, 250-256.
- West, W. (1968). Professional services of occupational therapists, World War II. In R. S. Anderson (Ed.), Army Medical Specialist Corps (pp. 287-338). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- West, W. (1976). Nationally Speaking--Research seminar. American Journal of Occupational therapy, 30, 477-478.
- Wolcott, L. L. (1999). Assessing faculty beliefs about rewards and incentives in distance education: Pilot study results. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED 435 271).
- Yerxa, E. J. (1991). Nationally Speaking--Occupational therapy: An endangered species or an academic discipline in the 21st century. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 45, 680-685.